Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

No. 1134

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL., APPELLANTS,

v.

MINNIE HARRELL, ET AL., APPELLEES.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

INDEX

	Page
Docket Entries in Harrell case	1
Amended Complaint in Harrell case	4
Docket Entries in Barley case	15
Complaint in Barley case	18
Docket Entries in Brown case	29
Complaint in Brown case	32
Intervenor's Complaint in Harrell and Brown cases	42
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	50
Motion of Defendants to Dismiss the Complaints or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment	54
Counter-Motion of Plaintiffs for Summary Judgment	55
Opinion of the Court	56
Decree of Court	88

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MINNIE HARRELL, individually, on behalf of her minor children, Yvonne Harrell, Virginia Harrell, and Gwendolyn Harrell, and on behalf of all other similarly situated

CLAY LEE LEGRANT, individually, and on behalf of her two minor children, Plaintiff Intervenor

v.

1. WALTER E. WASHINGTON, individually and as Commissioner of the Government of the District of Columbia
2. WINIFRED G. THOMPSON, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia
3. DONALD GRAY, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia
4. UDINE WILSON, individually, and as Chief, Intake Service Unit, Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare

---

CIVIL DOCKET

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
June 12	Complaint, appearance; Exhibits A(1), A(2), A (3), B and C
June 12	Motion of Pltff. For Preliminary Injunction; Affidavit.
June 12	Application of Pltff. for Convening of Three Judge District Court, P & A; Exhibit (1)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
June 16	Opposition of defts to pltf's application for three judge court
June 19	Application of pltfs for Three-Judge-Court argued and denied. Holtzoff, J.
June 21	Order denying application of plaintiffs for convening a Three-Judge Court. (N) Holtzoff, J.
June 23	Opinion of Court 6/19/67 PP. 1-5.
July 19	Certified copy of order of USCA granting petition for writ of mandamus.
July 26	Order consolidating case with C.A. 1579-67 and C.A. 1749-67. (signed 7/20/67) (N) Hart, J.
Aug 1	Designation of Honorable David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge, U.S.C.A. and Honorable Charles Fahy, Senior Circuit Judge to serve with the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, as members of a three judge Court. (N) Bazelon, C. J.
Aug 1	Amended complaint
Aug 2	Motion of defts to dismiss complaints or for summary judgment; exhibits A, B & C; P&A; statement
Aug 14	Opposition of pltf to defts' motion to dismiss or for summary judgment
Aug 25	Counter-motion of pltfs for summary judgment
Aug 21	Order permitting Clay Lee Legrant, individually and on behalf of her two minor children, to intervene without prepayment of costs or fees or to give security therefor. (N) Holtzoff, J.
Sep 1	Corrected copy of Oral Opinion of the Court (dated June 22, 1967) Holtzoff, J.
Sep 7	Motion of pltfs for preliminary injunction and cross-motions for summary judgment argued and and taken under advisement. (Reporter—G. Nevitt) Bazelon, C.J., Fahy, J. & Holtzoff, J.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
Sep 11	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law granting preliminary injunction (N) Bazelon, C. J. and Fahy, J.
Sep 11	Order enjoining pendnete lite or until further order of the Court defts from denying public assistance to pltfs. Bazelon, C.J. & Fahy, J., Dissent (N) Holtzoff, J.
Sep 15	Complaint of intervenor-plaintiff Clay Lee Legrant. Exh. filed
Oct 16	Order permitting actions to be maintained as class actions. Holtzoff, J.
Nov 8	Opinion finding one-year residence requirements of Section 3-203 (a) (b) of the Code are invalid in application to pltfs and those in like circumstances. (Judgment to be presented) (N) Bazelon, C. J. Fahy, Dissent: Holtzoff, J.
Nov 28	Order permanently enjoining defendants from enforcing or giving any legal effect to the provisions of Sections 3-203 (a) and (b), D.C. Code (1967 ed); from enforcing or giving any legal effect to such provisions of EL 9.I of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance and from refusing to process any application for aid to Families with Dependent Children, etc., (See order for Details) Bazelon, C.J., Fahy, J., and Holtzoff, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1497-67

MINNIE HARRELL

vs.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL.

AMENDED COMPLAINT

(for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief)

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment to declare that enforcement of a requirement of residency within the District of Columbia for one year prior to application as a precondition to eligibility for public assistance deprives plaintiffs, and the class they represent, of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and further constitutes an unconstitutional infringement of the plaintiffs' right to free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, or in the alternative to declare that each and every defendant has incorrectly interpreted the law of the District of Columbia by promulgating and enforcing regulations which result in the denial of public assistance to the plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, on the ground that plaintiff and her minor children are ineligible for public assistance in the District of Columbia because they have not lived in the District of Columbia one year prior to application for assistance.

2. This action also seeks a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction restraining each and every defendant from refusing public assistance to plaintiffs, and the class they represent, on the ground that the plaintiff

and her minor children are ineligible for public assistance because they do not satisfy requirements of one-year residency, and to require consideration of the application of plaintiffs for assistance without regard to such requirement of one-year residency; and to enjoin further the enforcement of the one year requirement of residency against plaintiffs and all others similarly situated, as a prerequisite to eligibility for public assistance, as constituting a deprivation of rights to due process and equal protection secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and an inhibition to rights of free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 11, Section 521 of District of Columbia Code; by Title 28, 1343 of the United States Code providing for original jurisdiction of this Court in suits authorized by Title 42, Section 1983 of the United States Code; by Title 28, Section 2201 relating to declaratory judgments; and by Title 28, Sections 2282 and 2284 of the United States Code providing for a three-judge District Court wherever an application is made for an injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the United States.

4. Plaintiff Minnie Harrell is an adult citizen of the United States and has resided continuously within the District of Columbia since September 3, 1966. She is the mother of the plaintiff children: Yvonne Harrell, age 9; Virginia Harrell, age 7; and Gwendolyn Harrell, age 2. All of these children have resided with their mother in the District since September 3, 1966, when they arrived here with their mother from New York.

5. Plaintiffs are members of a class composed of District of Columbia resident mothers and needy children who have been denied public assistance of any kind by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia on the ground that they have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior to application for assistance. Plaintiff, Minnie Harrell, is a member of a class composed of needy resident individuals who have been denied assistance for failure to satisfy the durational resi-

dency requirement because during their first year in the District they became public charges or wards in public institutions, and time spent in such institution could not count toward establishing residency. Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and all persons constituting the above class who are similarly situated. The persons in the class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical; there are questions of law or fact common to the class; the claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the class; and the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

6. Defendants: (a) Defendant Board of Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of D.C. Code 3-202 et. seq. (Supp. V), is responsible for administering the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, which authorizes programs entitled Aid to Families with Dependent Children (hereinafter referred to as AFDC) and General Public Assistance (hereinafter referred to as GPA), among other programs, and establishing rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act. Defendants Walter N. Tobriner, John B. Duncan and Brig. Gen. Robert E. Mathe are members of and constitute the defendant Board of Commissioners.

(b) Defendant Winifred G. Thompson is Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, a governmental agency of the District of Columbia, which has responsibility for the administration of AFDC, GPA, and other public assistance programs and whose agents have enforced the policies and practices herein complained of. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare performs all the functions vested in the Board of Commissioners by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, except the adoption and promulgation of regulations (D.C. Code § 3-220 (Supp. V); D.C. Code, Title I, Appendix, Reorg. Ord. No. 140 (Supp. V)).

(c) Defendant Donald Gray is Chief of the public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which Division has been delegated responsibility for the

supervision of public assistance programs, including GPA and AFDC.

(d) Defendant John White is Chief of Intake of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare. It is his delegated duty to evaluate the eligibility of applicants for public assistance according to the regulations of the Department of Public Welfare.

7. Plaintiff Minnie Harrell came to the District of Columbia with her three children from New York on September 3, 1966. She and her children have lived here continuously since that date. She had been receiving public assistance (AFDC) in the State of New York since separation from her husband in April, 1966. Having become seriously ill with cancer and separated from her husband, Mrs. Harrell came to the District of Columbia, where her brother and sister reside, so that during her illness she could be with her relatives who could care for her children if she had to be hospitalized. Plaintiff intends to remain permanently in the District of Columbia.

8. Continuing in ill health and being unable because of her health to obtain anything other than occasional employment as a domestic on a day basis, plaintiff went to the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare on December 13, 1966 and asked that Department to find out if she might be able to continue receiving assistance from the State of New York despite her current residence in the District of Columbia. The Department of Public Welfare for the District of Columbia inquired of the Department of Public Welfare of Suffolk County, New York whether assistance payments could be transmitted to the District of Columbia on behalf of the plaintiff's three minor children until such time as they had lived one continuous year in the District of Columbia. Other requests were made to the New York welfare authorities by caseworkers for the Travelers Aid Society of the District of Columbia and by Mrs. Grace E. Payne, Clinical Social Worker, Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia. New York has determined that plaintiff and her children are ineligible for further assistance. Plaintiff has received no public assistance payment from New York since leaving that jurisdiction. A copy of a letter dated April 20, 1967 from Mrs. Jane F. Berry, Supervisor, Department of Pub-

lic Welfare, District of Columbia to an attorney for the plaintiff, setting forth plaintiff's contacts with that Department; a copy of a letter dated March 13, 1967 from Mrs. Grace E. Payne, Clinical Social Worker, Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, D.C. to Mrs. D.W. Lindsey, Caseworker, Department of Public Welfare, 75 4th Avenue, Bay Shore, New York (confidential medical information blocked out), setting forth another attempt to obtain aid from the State of New York; and a copy of a letter dated June 2, 1967 from Mrs. Ruth Rosenhouse, Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C., to an attorney for the plaintiff, setting forth the attempts of that society to help plaintiff get assistance, are attached hereto as Exhibit A and are hereby incorporated by reference in this Complaint.

9. Plaintiff had been informally advised by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia at her first visit to the Department on December 13, 1966 that she and her children would not be eligible for assistance from the District of Columbia until such time as her children had lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year. On May 12, 1967, Mrs. Harrell formally applied for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children; and on that date the application was rejected in writing by defendant Donald Gray on the ground that plaintiff's three minor children had not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior to the date of application for public assistance, as required under the Agency's interpretation of D.C. Code 3-203. A copy of the Notice of ineligibility dated May 12, 1967 is attached hereto as Exhibit B and is hereby incorporated by reference in this Complaint.

10. While plaintiff children will be eligible for assistance on September 3, 1966, plaintiff mother, pursuant to District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B,3, will not be eligible for assistance until after November 3, 1967, since during her first year in the District plaintiff mother was hospitalized for surgery at Freedmen's Hospital from February 14, 1967, until April 13, 1967. Time spent in a public hospital as a public

charge does not count toward meeting the one year durational residency requirement (EL 9.1, III, B,2a).

11. The regulations adopted and enforced by the defendants, providing that time spent in an institution as a public charge during the first year an individual lives in the District of Columbia does not count toward establishing D.C. residence for welfare eligibility purposes (District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B,3) and that a patient or inmate of any public institution, such as a hospital, sanitarium, asylum, jail or penitentiary, or whose care is paid from Government funds in a private institution cannot gain residence while so institutionalized (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1 III, B,2a) are contrary to the laws of the District of Columbia and of the United States, in that they are contrary to D.C. Code 3-202 (b)(1) and 42 U.S.C. 601, as applied to plaintiff mother and the class she represents.

12. The regulations adopted and enforced by the defendants, providing that time spent in an institution as a public charge during the first year an individual lives in the District of Columbia does not count toward establishing D.C. residence for welfare eligibility purposes (District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B,3) and that a patient or inmate of any public institution cannot gain residence while so institutionalized (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B,2a) deprive plaintiff and the class she represents of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in that aforesaid regulations, read together, create an unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classification among individuals residing in the District of Columbia who are denied aid solely because, without fault on their part, they became public charges during their first year in the District,

13. The regulations enforced by the defendants, providing for denial of assistance to the plaintiff's three min-

or children, and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application (District of Columbia, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, I and III) are contrary to District of Columbia Code 3-203, which provides in subsections (a) and (c), read together, that assistance may be awarded to applicants such as the plaintiff's three minor children. Defendants have persisted in denying assistance to any applicant for assistance who has not lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application because they have erroneously construed District of Columbia Code 3-203 to forbid the authorization of assistance to any applicant who does not fulfill the one year residency requirement.

14. Defendant's refusal to consider further plaintiff's application for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

(a) The one year residence requirement allegedly set forth by District of Columbia Code 3-203, and in the regulations implementing said section (District of Columbia, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1), creates an unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classification among needy children who are residents of the District of Columbia in violation of due process and the equal protection of the laws under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in that plaintiff's children and all those similarly situated are denied aid solely because they were born in another jurisdiction and have not lived here one year without regard to the purposes of public assistance set forth in D.C. Code, 202 (b) (1) and the purposes of AFDC set forth in 42 U.S.C. 601. Said regulations implementing Section 203 of Title 3 are attached hereto as Exhibit C and are hereby incorporated by reference in this complaint.

(b) The enforcement of any residency requirement as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is an

abridgement of the rights of plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, as citizens of the United States, to move freely from state to state, to settle freely and without hinderance in the state of their choice, and to associate freely with relatives and friends, in violation of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and in violation of freedom of association protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

15. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that she and her children are eligible for public assistance on all other grounds of eligibility other than one year continuous residency in the District of Columbia.

16. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, on whose behalf this suit is brought, are suffering irreparable injury and are threatened with irreparable injury in the future by reason of the acts of defendants hereinbefore set forth. Due to refusal of defendants to further consider her application for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children despite their eligibility for assistance on all grounds other than one year residency, the three minor children of plaintiff have no dependable source of support. Having undergone prolonged hospitalization for major surgery for cancer, plaintiff and her three children are now and have been living with her brother, his wife, and their six children in a crowded four bedroom unit of the National Capital Housing Authority at 323 51st Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. Plaintiff is medically unable to work, and her relatives are financially unable to support her and her three children. Plaintiff and her three children have no other source of support, since the husband of the plaintiff, though under court order in New York to support, has not sent money since December, 1966. In order to keep the family together and prevent commitment of plaintiff's three minor children to Junior Village of the District of Columbia, an institution for dependent children, Family and Child Services of the District of Columbia has provided money for the purchase of food stamps for plaintiff's three minor children during April and May, 1967. The denial of public assistance benefits may result in the necessity of institutionalizing the children, thereby caus-

ing irreparable injury to the family life, well being, and physical and psychological health of plaintiff's children.

17. Unless enjoined by the Court, defendants will continue to refuse assistance to the plaintiffs, and all other similarly situated, for public assistance on the ground that they have not lived here for one continuous year prior to application.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray on behalf of themselves and those similarly situated:

1. That a three-judge court be convened to determine this controversy pursuant to Title 28, Section 2284, of the United States Code.

2. That this court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia, Department of Public Welfare, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 2a and EL 9.1, III, B,3, as applied to plaintiff, and the class she represents, are contrary to D.C. Code 3-202 (b) (1) and to 42 U.S.C. 601 and further declaring that aforesaid regulations are repugnant to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants, and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of the plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such regulations.

3. That this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203 makes it discretionary with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Welfare Department to award assistance to resident applicants who have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year and who are within the categories of assistance set forth in District of Columbia Code 3-202, that the Court declare the defendants' regulations implementing D.C. Code Section 3-203 void and unenforceable as erroneous interpretations of D.C. Code Section 3-203, and that this Court retain jurisdiction over this case with the purpose of future determination of the

constitutional issues raised herein if the defendants fail to further consider the applications of plaintiffs and all others similarly situated without regard to duration of residence in the District of Columbia.

4. That if this Court finds that District of Columbia Code 3-203 does in fact impose a mandatory requirement of one year residence in the District of Columbia before eligibility for public assistance can be established, that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to Title 28, Section 2201, declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203, and the regulations implementing that requirement, as contained in EL 9.1 of the Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants, and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such statute.

5. That this Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining each defendant, their successors in office, agents, and employees from enforcing District of Columbia Code 3-203 or the regulations implementing that section, including EL 9.1, III, B, 2a and EL 9.1, III, B,3 and ordering them to further consider the application for public assistance of plaintiff and her three children and all others similarly situated on the basis that the statute, in imposing a requirement of one year residency in the District of Columbia as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is violative of the rights of the plaintiffs under the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, or that the regulations providing that durational residency for public assistance purposes cannot be satisfied if an individual becomes a public charge during his first year in the District and remains a public charge are violative of the rights of the plaintiff under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

6. That this Court order defendants, Winifred Thompson and Donald Gray, if upon further processing of the application of plaintiff and her named minor children, the Department deems them to be eligible for public assistance, to establish plaintiff's and her children's eligibility

retroactively to the date of the first application for public assistance by the plaintiff on behalf of the named minor children and to disburse benefits retroactive to such date whereon plaintiff and her children would have become eligible for AFDC without regard to D.C. Code 3-203 or EL 9.1, III, B, 2a and EL 9.1, III, B,3.

7. That this Court allow plaintiffs their costs herein, and grant them and all others similarly situated such further, other, additional, or alternative relief as may appear to the Court to be just and appropriate.

[Certificate of Service Omitted in Printing]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VERA M. BARLEY, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

v.

1. WALTER E. WASHINGTON, individually and as Commissioner of the Government of the District of Columbia
2. WINIFRED G. THOMPSON, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia
3. DONALD GRAY, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia
4. UDINE WILSON, individually and as Chief, Intake Service Unit, Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare
6. VIVIAN JODON, INDIVIDUALLY and as Acting Chief, Intake Service Unit Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare for the District of Columbia

---

CIVIL DOCKET

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
June 20	Complaint, appearance Exhibits A, B & C.
June 20	Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Appendix A, Affidavit, Memorandum.
June 20	Application for convening of Three Judge District Court, P&A, Appendix I.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
Jun 28	Opposition of defendants to application of plaintiff for Three-Judge Court
Jun 29	Exhibit D of plaintiff. filed
Jul 6	Exhibit E of plaintiff
Jul 7	Application for convening Three Judge Court argued and stayed until U.S. Court of Appeals disposes of request for mandamus.
Jul 12	Order staying proceedings until the United States Court of Appeals rules in the mandamus proceeding of Harrell, et al v. the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff. (N) Walsh, J.
Aug 1	Designation of Honorable David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge, U.S.C.A. and Honorable Charles Fahy, Senior Circuit Judge to serve with the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, United States District Judge as members of a three judge court. (Original filed in C.A. 1497-67) Bazelon, C.J.
Aug 2	Motion of defts to dismiss complaints or for summary judgment; exhibits A, B and C; P&A; statement
Aug 14	Opposition of pltf to defts' motion to dismiss or for summary judgment
Aug 25	Counter-motion of pltfs for summary judgment; affidavit; statement; P&A; appendices A thru G
Sep 7	Motion of pltfs for preliminary injunction and cross-motions for summary judgment argued and taken under advisement. Bazelon, C.J., Fahy, J.& Holtzoff, J.
Sep 11	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law granting preliminary injunction. (N) Bazelon, C.J. and Fahy, Jr. (Original filed in C.A. 1497-67) filed
Sep 11	Order enjoining pendente lite or until further order of the Court defts from denying public assistance to pltfs. Bazelon, C.J. & Fahy, J.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
Oct 16	Order permitting actions to be maintained as class actions. Holtzoff, J.
Nov 8	Opinion finding one-year residence requirements of Section 3-203 (a) (b) of the Code are invalid in application to pltfs and those in like circumstances. (Judgment to be presented) (N) Bazelon, C. J. Fahy, Dissent: Holtzoff, J.
Nov 28	Order permanently enjoining defendants from enforcing or giving any legal effect to the provisions of Sections 3-203 (a) and (b), D.C. Code (1967 ed); from enforcing or giving any legal effect to such provisions of EL 9.I of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance and from refusing to process any application for aid to Families with Dependent Children, etc. (See order for Details) Bzelon, D.J., Fahy, J., Dissent Holtzoff, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1579-67

VERA M. BARLEY

vs.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL.

COMPLAINT

(for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief)

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment to declare that regulations adopted and enforced by the defendants which prevent plaintiff and all others similarly situated from satisfying the durational residency requirement for public assistance eligibility solely because they became public charges during their first year of residency in the District and subsequently remained public charges deprive plaintiff and all others similarly situated of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and that said regulations are contrary to the law of the District of Columbia and of the United States; or in the alternative to declare that each and every defendant has incorrectly interpreted the law of the District of Columbia by promulgating and enforcing regulations which result in the denial of public assistance to the needy plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, solely because they have not met the one year durational residency requirement; and that this Court declare that enforcement of a requirement of residency within the District of Columbia for one year prior to application as a precondition to eligibility for public assistance deprives plaintiff and the class she represents of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment

to the Constitution of the United States and further constitutes an unconstitutional infringement of the plaintiff's right to free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

2. This action also seeks a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction restraining each and every defendant from refusing public assistance to plaintiff, and the class she represents, on the ground that the plaintiff is ineligible for public assistance because she does not satisfy requirements of one-year residency, and to require consideration of the application of plaintiff for assistance without regard to such requirement of one-year residency or without regard to the regulations preventing plaintiff from meeting the durational residency requirement solely because of her commitment to St. Elizabeth's Hospital during her first year in the District, and to enjoin the enforcement of the regulations preventing plaintiff, and the class she represents, from satisfying the durational residency requirement, as constituting a deprivation of rights to due process and equal protection secured by the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and as being contrary to the law of the District of Columbia and of the United States; and to enjoin further the enforcement of the one year requirement of residency against plaintiff and all others similarly situated, as a prerequisite to eligibility for public assistance, as constituting a deprivation of rights to due process and equal protection secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and an inhibition to rights of free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 11, Section 521 of District of Columbia Code; by Title 28, 1343 of the United States Code providing for original jurisdiction of this Court in suits authorized by Title 42, Section 1983 of the United States Code; by Title 28, Section 2201 relating to declaratory judgments; and by Title 28, Sections 2282 and 2284 of the United States Code providing for a three-judge District Court wherever an application is made for an injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the Uinted States.

4. Plaintiff, Vera M. Barley, is an adult citizen of the United States and has resided continuously in St. Elizabeth's Hospital, District of Columbia, since her commitment to that institution on April 1, 1941 by the District Court for the District of Columbia. Plaintiff has been deemed competent since September 15, 1965, pursuant to D.C. Code 21-564.

5. Plaintiff is a member of a class composed of needy inmates of St. Elizabeth's Hospital who, like plaintiff, are ready for release into a foster care home in the community but who cannot be released because said inmates have no source of support available to sustain them except for public assistance grants to the partially or totally disabled or grants under General Public Assistance, for which they are not eligible because, pursuant to regulations promulgated and enforced by the defendants, they have not met the one year durational residency requirement for eligibility for public assistance regardless of the length of their stay in the hospital. Plaintiff is also a member of a larger class of needy resident individuals of the District of Columbia, including needy mothers and their children, who have been denied public assistance of any kind by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia on the ground that they have not satisfied the one year durational residency requirement imposed by the defendants as a precondition for receiving public assistance. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of herself and all persons constituting the above class who are similarly situated. The persons in the class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical; there are questions of law or fact common to the class; the claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the class; and the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

6. Defendants: (a) Defendant Board of Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of D.C. Code 3-202 et seq. (Supp. V), is responsible for administering the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, which authorizes programs entitled Aid to the Partially or Totally Disabled (hereinafter referred to as APTD) and General Public

Assistance (hereinafter referred to as GPA), among other programs, and establishing rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act. Defendants Walter N. Tobriner, John B. Duncan and Brig. Gen. Robert E. Mathe are members of and constitute the defendant Board of Commissioners.

(b) Defendant Winifred G. Thompson is Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, a governmental agency of the District of Columbia which has responsibility for the administration of APTD, GPA, and other public assistance programs and whose agents have enforced the policies and practices herein complained of. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare performs all the functions vested in the Board of Commissioners by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, except the adoption and promulgation of regulations (D.C. Code § 3-220 (Supp. V); D.C. Code, Title I, Appendix, Reorg. Ord. No. 140 (Supp. V)).

(c) Defendant Donald Gray is Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which Division has been delegated responsibility for the supervision of public assistance programs, including GPA and APTD.

(d) Defendant Vivian Jodan is Acting Chief of Intake Service Unit of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare. It is her delegated duty to evaluate the eligibility of applicants for public assistance according to the regulations of the Department of Public Welfare.

7. Plaintiff, Vera Barley, was born in 1901 in San Francisco, California. She, her husband, and two sons moved to Washington, D.C. in January of 1935, where they resided for one and one-half years. Plaintiff did not return to the District of Columbia until March, 1941, at which time she was and had been suffering from mental illness. Plaintiff was committed to St. Elizabeth's Hospital by court order on April 1, 1941, where she has remained to date. If released, plaintiff, who has been deemed competent since September 15, 1965 under D.C. Code 21-564, intends to live in the District of Columbia in a foster care home, as advised by her doctors. Plaintiff has no ties with any other jurisdiction and feels there is no other place

except the District of Columbia in which she wishes to live. Plaintiff's hospitalization has been and is being paid for by the District of Columbia at the rate of $414.90 per month. If she were permitted to live in a foster care setting outside the hospital, plaintiff would receive approximately $114 per month from the District of Columbia. During the 26 years she has been in the hospital, the District of Columbia has not been able to find any other jurisdiction which regards itself as legally obligated to care for her or which would accept her (D.C. Code 21-551).

8. Plaintiff was referred on Januay 19, 1967 to the Department of Public Welfare by Robert Howe, Social Worker, Foster Care Unit, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, for the purpose of establishing her eligibility for public assistance. This referral was made because plaintiff was deemed competent and able to live outside the institution if the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia would assist her financially so that she could be placed in a foster care home.

9. Plaintiff's application for assistance was rejected in writing by defendant Donald Gray on February 23, 1967 on the ground that plaintiff's one year residency in the District of Columbia prior to hospitalization, as required by Departmental regulations, could not be established.

10. By letter dated March 15, 1967 from Joseph F. Dugan, Esq. to defendant, Donald Gray, plaintiff requested an administrative hearing pursuant to Title 3, Section 214 of the District of Columbia Code to determine whether the action of defendant, Donald Gray, in refusing her public assistance, was correct.

11. On April 13, 1967, an administrative hearing was held, pursuant to Title 3, Section 214 of the District of Columbia Code, on the appeal filed by plaintiff requesting reversal of the agency action denying her assistance. A copy of the official Transcript of Record is annexed hereto as Exhibit *A*, and incorporated by reference into this Complaint.

12. By an opinion dated May 5, 1967, Hearing Officer Elbert D. Gadsden, sustained the Agency action referred to in the preceding paragraphs. A copy of the Hearing

Officer's Appeal Hearing, Summary of Findings, dated May 5, 1967, is attached hereto as Exhibit *B* and incorporated by reference into this Complaint.

13. By letter dated June 8, 1967, from defendant, Winifred Thompson, Director, Department of Public Welfare, plaintiff was notified that the Director had made a final administrative determination upholding the decision of the Hearing Officer affirming the Department's initial decision finding plaintiff ineligible for assistance because she was not a resident of the District of Columbia, as defined by the Department's regulations.

14. The regulations adopted and enforced by the defendants, providing that time spent in an institution as a public charge during the first year an individual lives in the District of Columbia does not count toward establishing D.C. residence for welfare eligibility purposes (District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 3) and that a patient or inmate of any public institution, such as a hospital, sanitarium, asylum, jail or penitentiary, or whose care is paid from Government funds in a private institution cannot gain residence while so institutionalized (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 2a) are contrary to the laws of the District of Columbia and of the United States, in that they are contrary to D.C. Code 3-202 (b) (1) and 42 U.S.C. 1351, as applied to plaintiff and the class she represents.

15. The regulations adopted and enforced by the defendants, providing that time spent in an institution as a public charge during the first year an individual lives in the District of Columbia does not count toward establishing D.C. residence for welfare eligibility purposes (District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 3) and that a patient or inmate of any public institution cannot gain residence while so institutionalized (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 2a) deprive plaintiff and the class she represents of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United

States, in that aforesaid regulations, read together, create an unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classification among individuals residing in the District of Columbia who are denied aid solely because, without fault on their part, they became public charges during their first year in the District.

16. The regulations enforced by the defendants, providing for denial of assistance to the plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, I and III) are contrary to District of Columbia Code 3-203, which provides in subsections (a) and (c), read together, that assistance may be awarded to an applicant such as the plaintiff. Defendants have persisted in denying assistance to any applicant for assistance who has not lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application because they have erroneously construed District of Columbia Code 3-203 to forbid the authorization of assistance to any applicant who does not fulfill the one year residency requirement.

17. Defendant's refusal to consider further plaintiff's application for public assistance because she has not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

(a) The one year residence requirement allegedly set forth by District of Columbia Code 3-203, and in the regulations implementing said section (District of Columbia Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1), creates an unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classification among residents of the District of Columbia in violation of due process and the equal protection of the laws under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in that plaintiff and all those similarly situated are denied aid solely because they have not lived here one continuous year prior to application without regard to the purposes of public assistance set forth in D.C. Code, 202 (b) (1) and 42 U.S.C. 1351. Said regulations implementing Section 203 of Title

3 are attached hereto as Exhibit C and are hereby incorporated by reference in this complaint.

(b) The enforcement of any residency requirement as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is an abridgement of the rights of plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, as a citizen of the United States, to move freely from state to state, to settle freely and remain in the state of her choice, and to associate freely with relatives and friends, in violation of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and in violation of freedom of association protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

18. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that she is eligible for public assistance on all other grounds of eligibility other than satisfaction of the durational residency requirement imposed by defendants.

19. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, on whose behalf this suit is brought, are suffering irreparable injury and are threatened with irreparable injury in the future by reason of the acts of defendants hereinbefore set forth. Due to refusal of defendants to consider further her application for public assistance despite her eligibility for assistance on all grounds other than residency, plaintiff must remain an inmate at St. Elizabeth's Hospital despite agreement among her attending physicians and social workers that she is ready for release and fully competent in all areas, including voting. Plaintiff is considered well enough to live in a foster care setting, but being unable to work because of her age and long period of institutionalization, she has no source of income to sustain herself in such a setting until she would have met the eligibility requirements for public assistance. No relatives or private charity are willing or able to assume the burden of supporting plaintiff. Plaintiff is but one of a class of numerous individuals currently committed to St. Elizabeth's Hospital whose health and well-being are being irreparably damaged because they must continue to be hospitalized in the absence of any means of support in a foster care setting outside the hospital. Without public assistance, plaintiff must remain in the hospital despite the fact that she is considered legally competent in all

areas, including voting. Continued hospitalization would irreparably injure plaintiff's future in that plaintiff's long sojourn at St. Elizabeth's Hospital has acclimated her to institutional life and if a change from institutionalized status is to be made, it must be made in plaintiff's current state of readiness.

20. Unless enjoined by the Court, defendants will continue to refuse assistance to the plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance on the ground that they have not met the durational residency requirement allegedly set forth in Title 3, Section 203 of the D.C. Code, as interpreted by EL 9.1, I and III, of the Regulations of the Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff respectfully prays on behalf of herself and those similarly situated:

1. That a three-judge Court be convened to determine this controversy pursuant to Title 28, Section 2284, of the United States Code.

2. That this court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia, Department of Public Welfare, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, III, B, 2a and EL 9.1, III, B, 3, as applied to plaintiff, and the class she represents, are contrary to D.C. Code 3-202 (b) (1) and to 42 U.S.C. 1351 and further declaring that aforesaid regulations are repugnant to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants, and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of the plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such regulations.

3. That this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203 makes it discretionary with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Welfare Department to award assistance to resident applicants who have not lived in the

District of Columbia for one year and who are within the categories of assistance set forth in District of Columbia Code, 3-202; that the Court declare the defendants' regulations implementing D.C. Code Section 3-203 void and unenforceable as erroneous interpretations of D.C. Code Section 3-203; and that this Court retain jurisdiction over this case with the purpose of future determination of the constitutional issues raised herein if the defendants fail to consider further the applications of plaintiff and all others similarly situated without regard to duration of residence in the District of Columbia.

4. That if this Court finds that District of Columbia Code 3-203 does in fact impose a mandatory requirement of one year residence in the District of Columbia before eligibility for public assistance can be established, that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to Title 28, Section 2201, declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203, and the regulations implementing that requirement, as contained in EL 9.1, I and III of the Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants, and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such statute.

5. That this Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining each defendant, their successors in office, agents, and employees from enforcing District of Columbia Code 3-203 or the regulations implementing that section, including EL 9.1, III, B, 2a and EL 9.1, III, B, 3, and ordering them to further consider the applications for public assistance of plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, on the basis that the statute, in imposing a requirement of one year residency in the District of Columbia as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is violative of the rights of the plaintiff under the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, or that the regulations providing that durational residency for public assistance purposes cannot be satisfied if an individual becomes a public charge during his first year in the District and re-

mains a public charge are violative of the rights of the plaintiff under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

6. That this Court allow plaintiff her costs herein, and grant her and all others similarly situated such further, other, additional, or alternative relief as may appear to the Court to be just and appropriate.

* * * * *

[Jurat Omitted in Printing]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GLORIA JEAN BROWN, on behalf of her minor children, Cassondra Brown, Felicia Brown, and Shawn Brown

CLAY LEE LEGRANT, individually and on behalf of her two minor children, Plaintiff Intervenor

v.

1. WALTER E. WASHINGTON, individually and as Commissioner of the Government of the District of Columbia
2. WINIFRED G. THOMPSON, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia
3. DONALD GRAY, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia

---

CIVIL DOCKET

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
July 7	Complaint, appearance; Exhibits "A" & "B"
July 7	Motion of Plaintiff For Preliminary Injunction; Affidavit; Memorandum; Appendix "A", "B" & "C"
July 7	Application of Pltff. for Convening of Three Judge District Court; P & A; Exhibit.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
Aug 1	Designation of Honorable David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge, U.S.C.A. and Honorable Charles Fahy, Senior Circuit Judge to serve with the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, United States District Judge as members of a three judge court. (N) (Original filed in C.A. 1497-67) Bazelon, CJ
Aug 2	Motion of defts to dismiss complaints or for summary judgment; exhibits A, B and C; P&A; statement
Aug 14	Opposition of pltf to defts' motion to dismiss or for summary judgment
Aug 21	Order permitting Clay Lee Legrant, individually and on behalf of her two minor children, to intervene without prepayment of costs or fees or to give security therefor. Holtzoff, J.
Aug 25	Counter-motion of pltfs for summary judgment; affidavit; statement; P&A; appendices A thru G; M.C.
Sep 7	Motion of pltfs for preliminary injunction and cross-motions for summary judgment argued and taken under advisement. (Reporter—G. Nevitt) Bazelon, C.J., Fahy, J.&Holtzoff,J.
Sep 11	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law granting preliminary injunction (N) Bazelon, C.J. & Fahy, J.
Sep 11	Order enjoining pendente lite or until further order of the Court defts from denying public assistance to pltfs. Bazelon, C.J. and Fahy, J. Dissent (N) Holtzoff, J. filed
Oct 16	Order permitting actions to be maintained as class actions. (original filed in C.A. 1497-67) Holtzoff, J.
Nov 8	Opinion finding one-year residence requirements of Section 3-203 (a) (b) of the Code are invalid in application to pltfs and those in like circumstances. (Judgment to be presented) (N) Bazelon, C. J. Fahy, Dissent: Holtzoff, J.

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1967	
Nov 28	Order permanently enjoining defendants from enforcing or giving any legal effect to the provisions of Sections 3-203 (a) and (b), D.C. Code (1967 ed); from enforcing or giving any legal effect to such provisions of EL 9.I of the District of Columbia Department of public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance and from refusing to process any application for aid to Families with Dependent Children, etc., (See order for Details) Bazelon, C.J., Fahy, J. Dissent Holtzoff, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1749-67

GLORIA JEAN BROWN

vs.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL.

COMPLAINT

(for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief)

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment to declare that enforcement of a requirement of residency within the District of Columbia for one year prior to application as a precondition to eligibility for public assistance deprives plaintiff's three children, and the class they represent, of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and further constitutes an unconstitutional infringement of the plaintiff's three children's right to free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, or in the alternative, to declare that each and every defendant has incorrectly interpreted the law of the District of Columbia by promulgating and enforcing regulations which result in the denial of public assistance to the plaintiff's three children, and all others similarly situated, on the ground that plaintiff's minor children are ineligible for public assistance in the District of Columbia because they have not lived in the District of Columbia one year prior to application for assistance, or, in the case of plaintiff's infant, because that infant was born before its mother satisfied the one year durational residency requirement.

2. This action also seeks a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction restraining each and every defendant from refusing public assistance to plaintiff's children, and the class they represent, on the ground that the plaintiff's minor children are ineligible for public assistance because they do not satisfy requirements of one-year residency, and to require consideration of the application of plaintiff's three children for assistance without regard to such requirement of one-year residency; and to enjoin further the enforcement of the one year requirement of residency against plaintiff's three children, and all others similarly situated, as a prerequisite to eligibility for public assistance, as constituting a deprivation of rights to due process and equal protection secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and an inhibition to rights of free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 11, Section 521 of District of Columbia Code; by Title 28, 1343 of the United States Code providing for original jurisdiction of this Court in suits authorized by Title 42, Section 1983 of the United States Code; by Title 28, Section 2201 relating to declaratory judgments; and by Title 28, Sections 2282 and 2284 of the United States Code providing for a three-judge District Court wherever an application is made for an injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the United States.

4. Plaintiff Gloria Jean Brown, suing on behalf of three of her four minor children, is an adult citizen of the United States and has resided continuously with her oldest child within the District of Columbia since on or about February 5, 1966. She is the mother of the plaintiff children: Cassondra Brown, age 3; Felicia Brown, age 22 months; and Shawn Brown, age 7 months. She is also the mother of Henry Canady, age 5. Gloria Jean Brown and her oldest child have satisfied the one-year durational residency requirement and have been receiving public assistance under the Aid to Families With Dependent Children program since February, 1967. Cassondra Brown and Felicia Brown joined their mother in the District of

Columbia in August, 1966. Shawn Brown was born in the District of Columbia on November 12, 1966, when his mother had lived in the District of Columbia nine months.

5. Plaintiff's children are members of a class composed of District of Columbia needy children who have been denied public assistance of any kind by the Departmen of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia on the ground that they have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior to application for assistance, or in the case of infants, were born before their mother met the one-year durational residency requirement. Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and all persons constituting the above class who are similarly situated. The persons in the class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical; there are questions of law or fact common to the class; the claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the class; and the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

6. Defendants: (a) Defendants, Walter N. Tobriner, John B. Duncar and Robert E. Mathe, are members of and constitute the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, who pursuant to the provisions of D.C. Code 3-202 et seq. (Supp. V), are responsible for administering the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, which authorizes programs entitled Aid to Families with Dependent Children (hereinafter referred to as AFDC) and General Public Assistance (hereinafter referred to as GPA), among other programs, and for establishing rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act.

(b) Defendant Winifred G. Thompson is Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, a governmental agency of the District of Columbia which has responsibility for the administration of AFDC, GPA, and other public assistance programs, and whose agents have enforced the policies and practices herein complained of. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare performs all the functions vested in the Board of Commissioners by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, except the adoption and promulga-

tion of regulations (D.C. Code § 3-220 (Supp. V); D.C. Code, Title I, Appendix, Reorg. Ord. No. 140 (Supp. V)).

(c) Defendant Donald Gray is Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which Division has been delegated responsibility for the supervision of public assistance programs, including GPA and AFDC.

7. Plaintiff Gloria Jean Brown came to the District of Columbia from Arkansas on or about February 5, 1966. Plaintiff's oldest child, Henry Canady, had been living with plaintiff's father, Reese Alexander Brown, 4421 Georgia Avenue, Washington, D.C., since 1962. Plaintiff had been living with her mother and two daughters (Cassondra Brown, age 3 and Felicia Brown, age 22 months) in a public housing project in Fort Smith, Arkansas. Both Cassondra and Felicia were born in Arkansas. Plaintiff received public assistance for herself and her daughters from the State of Arkansas from March, 1965 until February, 1966. In February, 1966, when plaintiff's mother moved to Oklahoma in order to obtain employment, plaintiff was informed she was ineligible for public housing because she was only 20 years of age. Plaintiff then left her daughters, Felicia and Cassondra, temporarily in the care of her grandmother in Fort Smith, Arkansas, and moved to Washington, where her oldest child, father, four sisters, two brothers, grandmother, six aunts and seven uncles reside, and where plaintiff herself had lived as a child for a few years and attended school.

In the last week of August, 1966, plaintiff's daughters, Felicia and Cassondra, were brought to Washington at her request by train and rejoined their mother. Plaintiff's fourth child, Shawn Brown, was born on November 12, 1966, in the District of Columbia. Plaintiff intends to remain indefinitely in the District of Columbia.

8. Shortly before the birth of her fourth child, Shawn, plaintiff, in November, 1966, applied for public assistance on behalf of her minor children but was told by a public assistance caseworker that her family was not eligible for failure to satisfy the one-year durational residency requirement. Plaintiff reapplied for public assistance for herself and her oldest child, Henry Canady, and was ac-

cepted for AFDC in February, 1967, after receiving emergency assistance from the Department of Public Welfare for January, 1967. Upon reapplication, plaintiff was told that her daughters Felicia and Cassondra would not be eligible for public assistance until August, 1967, and that Shawn would not be eligible until he had become one-year old because at the time of his birth on November 12, 1966, his mother had not been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year. Plaintiff has received no public assistance payment for Felicia, Shawn, or Cassondra, from either the State of Arkansas or the District of Columbia.

9. Plaintiff had been informally advised by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia at her first visit to the Department in November, 1966, that her three youngest children would not be eligible for assistance from the District of Columbia until such time as they had lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year. On June 27, 1967, Mrs. Brown formally applied for public assistance on behalf of her three youngest children; and by letter dated June 28, 1967, the application was rejected in writing by Mrs. Juanita N. Kydd, a social worker for the Department of Public Welfare responsible to and supervised by defendants Donald Gray and Winifred Thompson, on the ground that plaintiff's applicant children had not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior to the date of application for public assistance, as required under the Agency's interpretation of D.C. Code 3-203, and in the case of the infant, Shawn, was not born at a time when his mother had lived in the District of Columbia for one year. A copy of the aforementioned letter dated June 28, 1967, is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is hereby incorporated by reference in this Complaint.

10. The regulations promulgated and enforced by the defendants, providing for denial of assistance to the plaintiff's three minor children, and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application or in the case of an infant less than one year old because the infant's mother had not resided in the District of Columbia for one year prior to the birth (District of Columbia,

Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, I and III, A) are contrary to District of Columbia Code 3-203, which provides in subsections (a), (b), and (c), read together, that assistance may be awarded to applicants such as the plaintiff's three minor children. Defendants have persisted in promulgating and enforcing regulations which deny assistance to any applicant for assistance (child or adult) who has not lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application, or in the case of an infant less than one year old, if the applicant's mother had not resided in the District of Columbia for one year prior to the birth because they have erroneously construed District of Columbia Code 3-203 to forbid the authorization of assistance to any applicant (child or adult) who does not fulfill the one year durational residency requirement.

11. Defendant's refusal to consider further plaintiff's application for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children, Felicia, Shawn, and Cassondra, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application, or in the case of the infant less than one year old because its mother had not resided in the District of Columbia for one year prior to birth in the District of Columbia (3-203(b)), is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

(a) The one-year residence requirement allegedly set forth by District of Columbia Code 3-203(a) and in the regulations implementing said subsection (District of Columbia, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1), and the special residency requirements applicable to infants less than one year old set forth in 3-203(b) create unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classifications among needy children and infants less than one year old who are residents of the District of Columbia in violation of due process and the equal protection of the laws under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in that plaintiff's children and all those similarly situated are denied aid solely because they have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year preceding application, or in the case of an infant less than one year old because its mother had not

lived in the District of Columbia for one year preceding the birth, without regard to the purposes of public assistance set forth in D.C. Code 202(b)(1), the purposes of AFDC set forth in 42 U.S.C. 601, the resident status of the children's parent, or in the case of an infant less than one year old, the infant's place of birth. Said regulations implementing Section 203 of Title 3 are attached hereto as Exhibit B and are hereby incorporated by reference in this complaint.

(b) The enforcement of any residency requirement as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is an abridgement of the rights of plaintiff's children, and all others similarly situated, as citizens of the United States, to move freely from state to state, to settle freely and without hinderance in the state of their choice, and to associate freely with relatives and friends, in violation of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and in violation of freedom of association protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

12. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that her children, Felicia, Shawn, and Cassondra are eligible for public assistance on all other grounds of eligibility other than one year continuous residency in the District of Columbia prior to application or, in the case of Shawn, that his mother had not lived in the District of Columbia for one year preceding his birth.

13. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, on whose behalf this suit is brought, are suffering irreparable injury and are threatened with irreparable injury in the future by reason of the acts of defendants hereinbefore set forth. Due to refusal of defendants to further consider her application for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children despite their eligibility for assistance on all grounds other than one year residency, the three minor children of plaintiff have no dependable or adequate source of support. Plaintiff receives only $125 per month for the support of herself and four minor children. She pays $79.50 per month for rental of a three-room apartment at 4662 Hillside Road, S.E. Plaintiff is eligible for food stamps but must pay $34 per month for

food stamps worth $80 in food. After paying for rent and food stamps, plaintiff is left with $11.50 per month to pay utilities, buy clothing, etc. Plaintiff receives no support for her children from any source except public assistance. She is unable to work because she is needed at home to care for her young children and has no suitable child care plan. Plaintiff's relatives are financially unable to help her and do not currently assist her, although her father and aunt provided shelter and food during plaintiff's first nine months in the District of Columbia. Plaintiff's father, Reese Alexander Brown, is a janitor at the eighth precinct, has three dependents of his own, and cannot contribute to the support of plaintiff and her four children. In order to keep the family together and prevent commitment of plaintiff's three minor children to Junior Village of the District of Columbia, an institution for dependent children, Family and Child Services of the District of Columbia provided money for the purchase of food stamps for plaintiff's three minor children during June, 1967. The denial of public assistance benefits to three of plaintiff's four children may result in the necessity of institutionalizing the children in Junior Village, thereby causing irreparable injury to the family life well being, and physical and psychological health of plaintiff's children.

14. Unless enjoined by the Court, defendants will continue to refuse assistance to the plaintiff's children, and all other children similarly situated, for public assistance on the ground that they have not lived here for one continuous year prior to application or in the case of an infant less than one year old, that his mother had not lived in the District of Columbia for one year preceding its birth.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff respectfully prays on behalf of her three named minor children and those children similarly situated:

1. That a three-judge Court be convened to determine this controversy pursuant to Title 28, Section 2284, of the United States Code.

2. That this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203 makes it discretionary with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Welfare Department to award assistance to resident applicants who have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year and who are within the categories of assistance set forth in District of Columbia Code, 3-202; that the Court declare the defendants' regulations implementing D.C. Code Section 3-203 void and unenforceable as erroneous interpretations of D.C. Code Section 3-203; and that this Court retain jurisdiction over this case with the purpose of future determination of the constitutional issues raised herein if the defendants fail to further consider the applications of plaintiff's children and all other children similarly situated without regard to duration of residence in the District of Columbia.

3. That if this Court finds that District of Columbia Code 3-203 does in fact impose a mandatory requirement of one year residence in the District of Columbia before eligibility for public assistance can be established, that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to Title 28, Section 2201, declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203(a) and 3-203(b) and the regulations implementing those subsections, as contained in EL 9.1 of the Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, are repugnant to the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants, and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of plaintiff's children, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such statute.

4. That this Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining each defendant, their successors in office, agents, and employees from enforcing District of Columbia Code 3-203(a) and 3-203(b), or the regulations implementing those subsections, and ordering them further to consider the application for public assistance of plaintiff's three named children, and all others similarly

situated, on the basis that the statute, in imposing a requirement of one year residency in the District of Columbia as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance, is violative of the rights of the plaintiff's children under the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

5. That this Court order defendants, Winifred Thompson and Donald Gray, if upon further processing of the applications of plaintiff's three named children said children are determined under appropriate regulations to be eligible for public assistance, to establish plaintiff's children's eligibility retroactively to the date of the first application for public assistance by the plaintiff on behalf of the named minor children and to disburse benefits retroactive to such date whereon plaintiff's children would have become eligible for AFDC without regard to D.C. Code 3-203.

6. That this Court allow plaintiff her costs herein, and grant her named children, and all others similarly situated, such further, other, additional, or alternative relief as may appear to the Court to be just and appropriate.

* * * *

[Jurat Omitted in Printing]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1497-67 1749-67

* * * *

CLAY MAE LEGRANT, * * * INTERVENOR-PLAINTIFF

vs.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT
(for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief)

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment to declare that enforcement of a requirement of residency within the District of Columbia for one year prior to application as a precondition to eligibility for public assistance deprives plaintiffs, and the class they represent, of rights to due process and equal protection of the law secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and further constitutes an unconstitutional infringement of the plaintiff's right to free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, or in the alternative to declare that each and every defendant has incorrectly intepreted the law of the District of Columbia by promulgating and enforcing regulations which result in the denial of public assistance to the plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, on the ground that plaintiff and her minor children are ineligible for public assistance in the District of Columbia because they have not lived in the District of Columbia one year prior to application for assistance.

2. This action also seeks a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction restraining each and every defendant from refusing public assistance to plaintiffs, and

the class they represent, on the ground that the plaintiff and her minor children are ineligible for public assistance because they do not satisfy requirements of one-year residency, and to require consideration of the application of plaintiffs for assistance without regard to such requirement of one-year residency; and to enjoin further the enforcement of the one year requirement of residency against plaintiffs and all others similarly situated, as a prerequisite to eligibility for public assistance, as constituting a deprivation of rights to due process and equal protection secured by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and an inhibition to rights of free association guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 11, Section 521 of District of Columbia Code; by Title 28, 1343 of the United States Code providing for original jurisdiction of this Court in suits authorized by Title 42, Section 1983 of the United States Code; by Title 28, Section 2201 relating to declaratory judgments; and by Title 28, Sections 2282 and 2284 of the United States Code providing for a three-judge District Court wherever an application is made for an injunction restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the United States.

4. Plaintiff, Clay Mae Legrant, is an adult citizen of the United States and has resided continuously within the District of Columbia since March 15, 1967. She is the mother of the plaintiff children: Brenda Gail Legrant, age 5, and Andrew Legrant, age 1. Both children have resided with their mother in the District since March 15, 1967, when they arrived here with their mother from South Carolina.

5. Plaintiffs are members of a class composed of District of Columbia resident mothers and needy children who have been denied public assistance of any kind by the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia on the ground that they have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior to application for assistance. Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves

and all persons constituting the above class who are similarly situated. The persons in the class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical; there are questions of law or fact common to the class; the claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the class; and the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. The prosecution of separate actions by or against individual members of the class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class; adjudications with respect to individual members of the class would as a practical matter be dispositive of other members not parties to the adjudications; and further, defendants have denied public assistance to plaintiffs and others similarly situated on grounds generally applicable to the class.

6. Defendants: (a) Defendant Board of Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of D.C. Code 3-202 et seq. (Supp. V), is responsible for administering the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, which authorizes programs entitled Aid to Families with Dependent Children (hereinafter referred to as AFDC) and General Public Assistance (hereinafter referred to as GPA), among other programs, and establishing rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act. Defendants Walter N. Tobriner, John B. Duncan and Brig. Gen. Robert E. Mathe are members of and constitute the defendant Board of Commissioners.

(b) Defendant Winifred G. Thompson is Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, a governmental agency of the District of Columbia which has responsibility for the administration of AFDC, GPA, and other public assistance programs and whose agents have enforced the policies and practices herein complained of. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare performs all the functions vested in the Board of Commissioners by the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, except the adoption and promulgation of regulations (D.C. Code § 3-220 (Supp. V); D.C. Code, Title I, Appendix, Reorg. Ord. No. 140 (Supp. V)).

(c) Defendant Donald Gray is Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which Division has been delegated responsibility for the supervision of public assistance programs, including GPA and AFDC.

7. Plaintiff-intervenor, Clay Mae Legrant, came to the District of Columbia with her two children from South Carolina on March 15, 1967. She and her children have lived here continuously since that date. Plaintiff came to the District of Columbia after the death of her mother in order to be with her sister, who was living in the District of Columbia and because her younger brother had promised to join her here after his return from Vietnam. She had hoped to be self-supporting until such time as her brother was discharged from the Army in November, 1967. Plaintiff intends to remain permanently in the District of Columbia.

8. Being pregnant and arthritic and being unable because of her health and pregnancy to obtain anything other than occasional employment as a domestic on a day basis, plaintiff went to the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare to apply for public assistance on behalf of herself and her two minor children.

This application was rejected by a Notice of Ineligibility dated July 27, 1967 from defendant, Donald Gray, on the ground that plaintiff and her two minor children had not lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to the date of application for public assistance, as required under the Agency's interpretation of D.C. Code 3-203. A copy of the Notice of Ineligibility dated July 27, 1967 is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is hereby incorporated by reference in this Complaint.

9. The regulations enforced by the defendants, providing for denial of assistance to the plaintiff and her two minor children, and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application (District of Columbia, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1, I and III) are contrary to District of Columbia Code 3-203, which provides in subsections (a) and (c), read together, that assistance may be awarded to appli-

cants such as the plaintiff and her two minor children. Defendants have persisted in denying assistance to any applicant for assistance who has not lived in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application because they have erroneously construed District of Columbia Code 3-203 to forbid the authorization of assistance to any applicant who does not fulfill the one year residency requirement.

10. Defendant's refusal to consider further plaintiff's application for public assistance on behalf of her two minor children, and all others similarly situated, because they have not resided in the District of Columbia for one continuous year prior to application is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

(a) The one year residence requirement allegedly set forth by District of Columbia Code 3-203, and in the regulations implementing said section (District of Columbia, Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, EL 9.1), creates an unreasonable, arbitrary, and discriminatory classification among needy children who are residents of the District of Columbia in violation of due process and the equal protection of the laws under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in that plaintiff's children and all those similarly situated are denied aid solely because they were born in another jurisdiction and have not lived here one year without regard to the purposes of public assistance set forth in D.C. Code, 202 (b) (1) and the purposes of AFDC set forth in 42 U.S.C. 601.

(b) The enforcement of any residency requirement as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is an abridgement of the rights of plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, as citizens of the United States, to move freely from state to state, to settle freely and without hinderance in the state of their choice, and to associate freely with relatives and friends, in violation of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and in violation of freedom of association protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

11. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that she and her children are eligible for public assistance on all other grounds of eligibility other than one year continuous residency in the District of Columbia.

12. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, on whose behalf this suit is brought, are suffering irreparable injury and are threatened with irreparable injury in the future by reason of the acts of defendants hereinbefore set forth. Due to refusal of defendants to further consider her application for public assistance on behalf of her two minor children despite their eligibility for assistance on all grounds other than one year residency, the two minor children of plaintiff have no dependable source of support. Plaintiff and her children are living in a one bedroom apartment in a condemmed building at 704 Second Street, N.W., which has been taken over by the Redevelopment Land Agency. Plaintiff is medically unable to work, and her relatives are financially unable to support her and her two children. Plaintiff has been living with a sister, Mrs. Martha Graham, and a neice, Miss Carrie Lee Graham. Mrs. Graham's only income is from public assistance, and Miss Graham earns $39.66 a week as a hairdressers [sic] in Maryland. These relatives have paid the $42 a month rent in the Second Street apartment and have been providing food for plaintiff and her family. On August 12, 1967 Mrs. Graham was moved into an efficiency public housing unit, leaving only plaintiff's niece to care for plaintiff and her two children. Plaintiff and her two children have no other source of support, since the father of plaintiff's children does not contribute to the support of the children and his current whereabouts are unknown. In order to keep the family together and prevent commitment of plaintiff's two minor children to Junior Village of the District of Columbia, an institution for dependent children, Family and Child Services of the District of Columbia has provided money for the purchase of food for plaintiff's two minor children. The denial of public assistance benefits may result in the necessity of institutionalizing the children, thereby causing irreparable injury to the family life, well being, and physical and psychological health of plaintiff's children.

13. Unless enjoined by the Court, defendants will continue to refuse assistance to the plaintiffs, and all other [sic] similarly situated, for public assistance on the ground that they have not lived here for one continuous year prior to application.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

THEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray on behalf of themselves and those similarly situated:

1. That a three-judge court be convened to determine this controversy pursuant to Title 28, Section 2284, of the United States Code.

2. That this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2201 declaring that District of Columbia Code 3-203 makes it discretionary with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Welfare Department to award assistance to resident applicants who have not lived in the District of Columbia for one year and who are within the categories of assistance set forth in District of Columbia Code 3-202, that the Court declare the defendant's regulations implementing D.C. Code Section 3-203 void and unenforceable as erroneous interpretations of D.C. Code Section 3-203, and that this Court retain jurisdiction over this case with the purpose of future determination of the constitutional issues raised herein if the defendants fail to further consider the applications of plaintiffs and all others similarly situated without regard to duration of residence in the District of Columbia.

3. That if this Court finds that District of Columbia Code 3-203 does in fact impose a mandatory requirement of one year residence in the District of Columbia before eligibility for public assistance can be established, that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to Title 28, Section 2201, declaring the District of Columbia Code 3-203, and the regulations implementing that requirement, as contained in EL 9.1 of the Handbook of Public Assistance Policies and Procedures, are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and that the defendants,

and each of them, are required by the Constitution of the United States to consider the application of plaintiffs, and all others similarly situated, for public assistance without reference to such statute.

4. That this Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining each defendant, their successors in office, agents, and employees from enforcing District of Columbia Code 3-203 or the regulations implementing that section, and ordering them to further consider the application for public assistance of plaintiff and her two children and all others similarly situated on the basis that the statute, in imposing a requirement of one year residency in the District of Columbia as a prerequisite for eligibility for public assistance is violative of the rights of the plaintiffs under the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

5. That this Court order defendants, Winifred Thompson and Donald Gray, if upon further processing of the application of plaintiff and her named minor children, the Department deems them to be eligible for public assistance, to establish plaintiff's and her children's eligibility retroactively to the date of the first application for public assistance by the plaintiff on behalf of the named minor children and to disburse benefits retroactive to such date whereon plaintiff and her children would have become eligible for AFDC without regard to D.C. Code 3-203.

6. That this Court allow plaintiffs their costs herein, and grant them and all others similarly situated such further, other, additional, or alternative relief as may appear to the Court to be just and appropriate.

* * * *

[Jurat Omitted in Printing]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Title Omitted in Printing]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Findings of Fact

Upon the basis of information now before the court, the court finds that:

1. Plaintiffs are Minnie Harrell, individually and for her minor children, Yvonne Harrell, Virginia Harrell, and Gwendolyn Harrell; Gloria Jean Brown, for her minor children, Cassondra Brown, Felicia Brown, and Shawn Brown; and Vera M. Barley.

2. Intervenor-Plaintiff is Clay Mae Legrant, individually and for her minor children, Brenda Gail Legrant and Andrew Legrant.

3. Defendants are Walter N. Tobriner, individually and as President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; John B. Duncan and Robert E. Mathe, individually and as members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Winifred G. Thompson, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Donald Gray, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; and Vivian Jodon, Chief of Intake, Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

4. Plaintiff Minnie Harrell and her two children arrived in the District of Columbia from New York on, and have continuously resided here since, September 3, 1966.

5. Plaintiff Gloria Jean Brown arrived in the District of Columbia from Arkansas on, and has continuously re-

sided here since, February 5, 1966. Two of her plaintiff children arrived in the District of Columbia from Arkansas in, and have continuously resided here since, late August, 1966. Her third plaintiff child was born in the District on, and has continuously resided here since, November 12, 1966.

6. Plaintiff Vera M. Barley arrived in the District of Columbia in, and has continuously resided here since, March, 1941. On April 1, 1941, she was committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital, where she has remained to this date. She has been deemed eligible for release into a foster care home in the community since September 15, 1965.

7. Intervenor-Plaintiff Clay Mae Legrant and her two children arrived in the District of Columbia from South Carolina on, and have continuously resided here since, March 15, 1967.

8. Defendants are variously charged with the powers and duties of establishing rules and regulations for the administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, determining the eligibility of applicants, awarding funds, and generally supervising the public assistance program in the District of Columbia.

9. Defendants have construed Title 3, Section 203, of the District of Columbia Code (1967) so as to authorize the award of public assistance only to or on behalf of persons who have continuously resided in the District of Columbia for one year immediately preceding application for assistance. In consequence of this interpretation, defendants have promulgated regulations which variously provide that:

(a) in order to qualify for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the child must have been a resident of the District for one year immediately preceding application;

(b) in order to qualify for Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled and for General Public Assistance, the applicant must have been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year immediately preceding his application;

(c) time spent in an institution as a public charge during the first year of living in the District of Columbia does not count toward establishing residence here;

(d) residence in the District of Columbia is acquired, in the case of a child born in the District, only if or at the time that the parent or caretaker relative of the child has resided in the District for one year preceding the child's birth;

(e) residence is not acquired while the applicant is a patient or inmate of any public institution, such as a hospital or sanitarium.

10. On May 12, 1967, Minnie Harrell applied for public assistance on behalf of her three minor children. On the same date, defendant Donald Gray rejected this application on the ground that the children had "not lived in the District of Columbia for one year prior the date of your application . . . ."

11. Shortly before the birth of her fourth child in November, 1966, plaintiff Gloria Jean Brown applied for public assistance. A caseworker informed plaintiff that she and her family were not eligible for public assistance because they had not satisfied the one-year residency requirement. Plaintiff re-applied in early 1967, but was advised that two of her children would not be eligible until August, 1967, and that her youngest child would not be eligible until November, 1967.

12. Plaintiff Vera M. Barley applied for public assistance. On February 23, 1967, defendant Donald Gray rejected her application on the ground that plaintiff had not resided in the District of Columbia for one year prior to hospitalization. On March 15, 1967, plaintiff requested an administrative hearing pursuant to Title 3, Section 214, of the District of Columbia Code (1967). On April 13, 1967, an administrative hearing was held; and on May 5, 1967, Hearing Officer Elbert D. Gadsden sustained the action of the Department of Public Welfare.

13. Intervenor-Plaintiff Clay Mae Legrant applied for public assistance. On July 27, 1967, defendant Donald Gray rejected her application on the ground that plaintiff and her two minor children had not lived in the District of Columbia "for one year prior to application."

14. All of the plaintiffs arrived in the District of Columbia for bona fide reasons disassociated from a purpose to obtain public assistance, and intend to remain in the District indefinitely.

15. If plaintiffs do not receive financial assistance they will suffer irreparable loss, injury, and damage. Plaintiffs Minnie Harrell and Gloria Jean Brown and plaintiff-intervenor Clay Mae Legrant are unable to work and do not have sufficient funds with which to pay for rent, food, and clothing for their children. As a result, plaintiff children may have to be committed to Junior Village, an institution for dependent children. Plaintiff Vera M. Barley, though eligible to be released from Saint Elizabeths Hospital, is unable to leave St. Elizabeths since she does not have sufficient funds to pay for the costs of a foster care home. She cannot obtain such funds without public assistance.

Conclusions of Law

1. This court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter.

2. Plaintiffs have raised substantial questions in respect of the constitutionality of Title 3, Section 203, of the District of Columbia Code (1967) and certain regulations promulgated pursuant thereto. *Green* v. *Department of Public Welfare of Delaware*, C.A. No. 3349, D. Del., June 28, 1967; *Thompson* v. *Shapiro*, C.A. No. 11,-821, D. Conn., June 19, 1967; *Smith* v. *Reynolds*, C.A. No. 42419, E.D. Pa., June 5, 1967.

3. Plaintiffs are entitled to a preliminary injunction as prayed.

/s/ David L. Bazelon
Chief Circuit Judge

/s/ Charles Fahy
Senior Circuit Judge

Dated: September 11, 1967.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Title Omitted in Printing]

MOTION OF DEFENDANTS TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINTS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

The defendants hereby move the Court to dismiss the complaints filed herein on the ground that they fail to state a claim against the defendants upon which relief can be granted. In the alternative, the defendants move the Court to enter summary judgment in their favor on the ground that a reading of the complaints filed herein, together with Exhibits "A", "B", and "C" attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof, demonstrate that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

* * * *

[Certificate of Service Omitted in Printing]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Title Omitted in Printing]

COUNTER-MOTION OF PLAINTIFFS
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

The plaintiffs hereby move the Court to enter summary judgment in their favor on the ground that a reading of the verified complaints filed herein, together with the affidavits in support of the motions for preliminary injunction in the above-captioned cases, and the affidavit in support of motion for summary judgment, attached hereto, demonstrate that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

* * * *

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1497-67

MINNIE HARRELL, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS
CLAY MAE LEGRANT, PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR

v.

WALTER N. TOBRINER, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Civil Action No. 1579-67

VERA M. BARLEY, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

WALTER N. TOBRINER, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Civil Action No. 1749-67

GLORIA JEAN BROWN, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS
CLAY MAE LEGRANT, PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR

v.

WALTER N. TOBRINER, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

OPINION

David H. Marlin, of Washington, D. C., and Laurens H. Silver, of Washington, D. C., for plaintiffs.

Charles T. Duncan, Corporation Counsel, and John A. Earnest and John H. Suda, Assistant Corporation Counsel, for defendants.

Before BAZELON, Chief Circuit Judge, FAHY, Senior Circuit Judge, and HOLTZOFF, District Judge.

FAHY, Circuit Judge. Plaintiffs and intervenor,[1] all now to be referred to as plaintiffs, in slightly differing

[1] See note 3 *infra*.

factual situations applied for public assistance under the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, Title 3, Chapter 2, D.C. Code (1967). Defendants, who have official responsibility in the matter, denied the applications. The sole ground of denial was that plaintiffs and the minor children on whose behalf they sought aid had not complied with the residence requirements of D.C. Code § 3-203(a), (b) (1967), set forth in the margin insofar as pertinent to this case,[2] and with the regulations promulgated pursuant to the statute. Plaintiffs seek relief by declaratory judgments and injunctions against enforcement by defendants of such residence requirements.[3] The complaints proceed on two theories, first, that Section 3-203 vests a discretion in the defendants to disregard the one-year residence requirements, and they have not exercised such discretion, and, second, that if there is no such discretion the one-year residence requirements of Section 3-203 are constitutionally invalid.

---

[2] § 3-203. Eligibility for public assistance.

Public assistance shall be awarded to or on behalf of any needy individual who either (a) has resided in the District for one year immediately preceding the date of filing his application for such assistance; or (b) who was born within one year immediately preceding the application for such aid, if the parent or other relative with whom the child is living has resided in the District for one year immediately preceding the birth; or (c) is otherwise within one of the categories of public assistance established by this chapter: . . .

[3] In the case of plaintiff Minnie Harrell and her co-plaintiffs neither she nor they had resided in the District a year when she applied. In the case of Gloria Jean Brown, et al., who sues on behalf of three children, the children had not resided a year here when application for them was made. In the case of Vera M. Barley the denial of her application was on the ground that her residence at St. Elizabeths Hospital for a period which otherwise was more than adequate could not be considered because under the regulations residence could not be "gained" while one was confined to a public institution. She has been deemed competent since September 15, 1965, but is without financial resources sufficient to obtain care in a foster home, which prevents her, without public assistance, leaving St. Elizabeths. In the case of intervenor Clay Mae LeGrant neither she nor her children had resided here a year when applications for them were made.

This three-judge District Court was convened pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2282[4] and was composed under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 2284.

On September 11, 1967, after argument, we granted the motion of plaintiffs for a preliminary injunction pendente lite or until the further order of the court.[5] We accompanied our order with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the findings setting forth in detail the factual situation of each plaintiff, which still prevails in essential respects. The matter is decided now on motions for summary judgment submitted by both plaintiffs and defendants, enabling us to decide the merits, there being no genuine issues of material fact requiring an evidentiary hearing.

I

We agree with defendants that Section 3-203 does not grant defendants a discretion to disregard the one-year residence requirements applicable to plaintiffs. This construction is supported not only by the language of the

---

[4] 28 U.S.C. § 2282:

> An interlocutory or permanent injunction restraining the enforcement, operation or execution of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the United States shall not be granted by any district court or judge thereof unless the application therefor is heard and determined by a district court of three judges under section 2284 of this title.

[5] The order in its operative part reads:

> That the defendants, Walter N. Tobriner, individually and as President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; John B. Duncan and Robert E. Mathe, individually and as members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; Winifred G. Thompson, individually and as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Donald Gray, individually and as Chief of the Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; and Vivian Jodon, Chief of Intake, Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, be, and hereby are, enjoined, pendente lite or until further order of the court, from denying public assistance to plaintiffs by reason of any of the one-year residence requirements of Title 3, Section 203, of the District of Columbia Code (1967) and regulations thereunder. [District Judge Holtzoff's dissent was noted on the order.]

statute but also by its legislative history. The Senate District of Columbia Committee in its Report on the Act stated that one of the congressional purposes was to

> (c) Make uniform in all categories a 1-year residence requirement for public assistance eligibility. (S. Rep. No. 844, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1961).)

The administrators of the program have consistently interpreted the statute as the legislative history thus indicates Congress intended, that is, that the language "public assistance shall be awarded" to those who meet the one-year conditions means that the assistance is not to be granted unless those conditions are met. This consistent and reasonable interpretation by those charged with the duty of administering the statute is entitled to great weight. *Zemel* v. *Rusk*, 381 U.S. 1, 11; *Udall* v. *Tallman*, 380 U.S. 1, 16; *United States* v. *American Trucking Association*, 310 U.S. 534, 549. Moreover, we independently interpret the language used by Congress in like manner. It becomes our duty therefore to decide the validity of the challenged parts of the statute as so construed.[6]

II

A court approaches its responsibility of passing upon the constitutional validity of an Act of Congress aware that Congress also interprets the Constitution. This is so even though Congress' judgment is manifested, as in the present case, merely by passage of the legislation

---

[6] None of the parties questions the application of Section 2282 on the ground that the Code provision is not an "Act of Congress" within the meaning of Section 2282. In this connection see *Hobson* v. *Hansen*, 265 F. Supp. 902. *Flemming* v. *Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, is not to the contrary, for there the issue of constitutional validity of the statute arose and was decided under judicial review procedures established by the statute under which the determination arose, not by direct suit such as we have to enjoin the operation of a statute and regulations thereunder. In this connection we bear in mind also the three-judge District Court requirements of 18 U.S.C. § 2281, applicable to the challenge of state-wide legislation. The District of Columbia, though not a state, is comparable to a state in considering this problem.

rather than by explicit treatment of the constitutional question. Moreover, as Mr. Justice Goldberg stated for the Court in *Kennedy* v. *Mendoza-Martinez*, 372 U.S. 144, 159:

> Since the validity of an Act of Congress is involved, we begin our analysis mindful that the function we are now discharging is "the gravest and most delicate duty that this Court is called upon to perform." *Blodgett* v. *Holden*, 275 U.S. 142, 148 (separate opinion of Holmes, J.). This responsibility we here fulfill with all respect for the powers of Congress, but with recognition of the transcendent status of our Constitution.

In *Trop* v. *Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 103-04, Mr. Chief Justice Warren had stated the matter as it must be considered:

> The provisions of the Constitution are not time-worn adages or hollow shibboleths. They are vital, living principles that authorize and limit governmental powers in our Nation. They are the rules of government. When the constitutionality of an Act of Congress is challenged in this Court, we must apply those rules. If we do not, the words of the Constitution become little more than good advice.
>
> When it appears that an Act of Congress conflicts with one of these provisions, we have no choice but to enforce the paramount command of the Constitution. We are sworn to do no less. . . . We do well to approach this task cautiously, as all our predecessors have counseled. But the ordeal of judgment cannot be shirked.

In line with the caution thus admonished, applicable to us certainly no less than to the Supreme Court, we should construe the challenged portions of Section 3-203 so as to avoid a serious constitutional question if reasonably able to do so. *United States* v. *Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 45. But it seems clear to us that Congress intended to impose one-year residence requirements as conditions, similar to conditions prevailing in numerous other jurisdictions. There is no evidence of a congressional intent to

depart from a rather widespread legislative pattern in this area. This pattern lends support to defendants' interpretation of Section 3-203 as precluding a discretion on their part to disregard the requirements. Our agreement with defendants' interpretation requires us to reach the constitutional question.

Any weight the legislative pattern gives to defendants' constitutional position, however, as distinguished from their statutory interpretation, we think is overcome by considerations which stem primarily from the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment and applicable to this jurisdiction by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.[7]

Notwithstanding the frequent use of such a residence condition, only recently has it come before federal courts for decision as to its validity. Nine federal judges, in three separate cases, with one judge dissenting, have recently considered the constitutional questions involved. *Thompson* v. *Shapiro*, 270 F. Supp. 331 (a three-judge District Court of the District of Connecticut); *Green* v. *Department of Public Welfare*, 270 F. Supp. 173 (a three-judge District Court of the District of Delaware); and *Smith* v. *Reynolds*, —— F. Supp. —— (a three-judge District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). In *Thompson* and *Green* the residence requirements, respectively, of Connecticut and Delaware, were held unconstitutional. In *Smith* v. *Reynolds* a final decision has not been reached, but enforcement of such a requirement in Pennsylvania has been enjoined preliminarily on constitutional grounds.

In *Thompson* the court first concluded the provision constituted an arbitrary classification in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's prohibition against state abridgment of the privilege and immunity of a citizen of the United States to enjoy the liberty to travel interstate. The court relied heavily upon *Edwards* v. *California*, 314

[7] Denial of equal protection offends the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, applicable to this jurisdiction, as well as the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth, applicable in terms to the States. *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497; *Schneider* v. *Rusk*, 377 U.S. 163, 168.

U.S. 160. The court also relied upon a more general liberty of the citizen to travel, upheld by the Supreme Court in the passport cases, including *Kent* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 126-127, and *United States* v. *Guest*, 383 U.S. 745, 759. The *Thompson* court said:

> the right to travel exists and included within its dimensions is the right to establish residence in Connecticut. Denying to the plaintiff even a gratuitous benefit because of her exercise of her constitutional right effectively impedes the exercise of that right.

270 F. Supp. at 336.

Second, the court in *Thompson* decided that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment was violated:

> . . . the classifications of one year's residence or a job are not reasonable in light of the purpose of § 17-2d because again there is no showing that those applicants will be lesser burdens than applicants without jobs or one year's residence. Section 17-2d, in brief, violates the equal protection clause because even if its purpose were valid, [to protect the finances of the states] which it is clearly not, the classifications are unreasonable.

Id. at 338.

In *Green*, the court, in holding invalid the Delaware one-year requirement for public assistance, said that the test under the Equal Protection Clause was whether the classification based on residence was reasonably related to the purpose of the statute, citing *Morey* v. *Doud*, 354 U.S. 457. The court then pointed out that the purpose of the public assistance program was " 'to promote the welfare and happiness of all people of the State, by providing public assistance to all of its needy and distressed, that assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely with due regard for the preservation of family life . . .' " 270 F. Supp. at 177.

With these purposes in mind the court considered the reasonableness of the one-year residence provision in relation to those purposes, holding,

> It is evident to us that as to these families living in Delaware for less than one year the denial of public assistance fails to carry out the stated purposes for the Public Assistance Code. It in fact tends to frustrate them. The residency requirement prevents prompt assistance to some of the State's needy and distressed and to that extent is the antithesis of "humane." It also necessarily results in pressure on the solidarity of the family unit. Nor given these circumstances is it an acceptable answer to say that until they are here one year such persons are not a part of the state's needy and distressed. The discrimination based on length of residency thus finds no constitutional justification in the purpose declared in the statute itself.

We have given first consideration to the above three-judge District Court cases because they are recent decisions on precisely the same subject and are not decisions of more remote application. We must be certain, however, that they comport with principles established by the Supreme Court. Although the Court has not dealt with this particular situation its decisions in other areas reveal the applicable principles, and to them we now turn.

In *McLaughlin* v. *Florida*, 379 U.S. 184, 191, our task in interpreting the Equal Protection Clause is stated as follows:

> The court must reach and determine the question whether the classifications drawn in a statute are reasonable in light of its purpose. . . .

Carrington v. *Rash*, 380 U.S. 89, 93, restated this test in exactly the same language.

In *Bates* v. *Little Rock*, 361 U.S. 516, 525, a case involving First Amendment rights of association, the Court declared that,

> When it is shown that state action threatens significantly to impinge upon constitutionally protected freedom it becomes the duty of this Court to determine whether the action bears a reasonable relationship to the achievement of the governmental purpose asserted as its justification.

In *Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Ry.* v. *Ellis*, 165 U.S. 150, 155 (1897), the power of classification was recognized as permitted by the Fourteenth Amendment, but the Court added that: "it is equally true that such classification cannot be made arbitrarily."

More specifically, in *Truax* v. *Raich*, 239 U.S. 33, 42 (1915), the Court stated that "reasonable classification implies action consistent with the legitimate interests of the State. . . ."

A principal purpose of Section 3-203 obviously is to provide public assistance to the needy. Moreover, the immediately preceding section provides that the entire public assistance chapter shall be administered so as to provide the maximum cooperation with other agencies rendering services in order "to maintain and strengthen family life and to help applicants for public assistance and recipients to attain self-support or self-care." D.C. Code § 3-202(b)(1) (1967). These purposes constitute the keystone of the legislation. A bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for six months who is indigent and without the means by which to support herself and her children is no less in need of public assistance than an indigent who has been here for a full year. The basic purposes of the legislation—public assistance to those in need, maintenance and strengthening of famiy life, achievement of self-support and self-care—are not more faithfully served by withholding aid until applicants have lived here for twelve months. Indeed, the denial of assistance for an entire year to otherwise qualified recipients may only erode values which the statute tries to promote. The spread over a year's time of the evils which public assistance seeks to combat may mean that aid, when it becomes available, will be too late: Too late to prevent the separation of a family into foster homes or Junior Villages; too late to heal sickness due to malnutrition or exposure; too late to help a boy from succumbing to crime.[8]

---

[8] Recent studies have confirmed:

> Burglary, robbery, and serious assaults occur in areas characterized by low income, physical deterioration, dependency, racial and ethnic concentrations, broken homes, working mothers, low levels of education and vocational skill, high

Section 3-203 creates two classes of persons: those who have resided in the District of Columbia for one year or longer, and those who have resided here for less than one year. Although the Supreme Court has recognized that a "legislature is free to make classifications in the application of a statute which are relevant to the legislative purpose," it has emphasized that the "ultimate test of validity is not whether the classes differ but whether the differences between them are pertinent to the subject with respect to which the classification is made." *Asbury Hospital* v. *Cass County*, 326 U.S. 207, 214. If a six-month resident is denied the assistance given to a one-year resident, in circumstances in which each is otherwise within the requirements of the statute, the former is denied the equal protection of the law, for the clearly different treatment has no reasonable relation to the basic legislative purposes. The disqualifying requirement applicable to plaintiffs thus engrafts upon the legislation an invalid provision. The same reasons which led the courts in the *Thompson* and *Green* cases, and pendente lite in the *Smith* case, to hold comparable provisions invalid as classifications without a reasonable relation to the purposes of the legislation apply to our cases.

III

We consider now arguments which have been urged in support of the residence requirement.

It is said that Congress in gratuitously providing for assistance may not be held to constitutional standards. The decisions are to the contrary. In *Sherbert* v. *Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404, the Supreme Court held that the fact that "unemployment compensation benefits are not appellant's 'right' but merely a 'privilege'" does not save a statute limiting such rights from "consitutional infirm-

---

unemployment, high proportions of single males, overcrowded and substandard housing, high rates of tuberculosis and infant mortality, low rates of home ownership or single family dwellings, mixed land use, and high population density. *President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* 35 (1967).

ity."[9] There is no indication in our cases that Congress desired unequal protection of the laws. Congress viewed the eligibility provision as justified. Our judicial problem is to determine the reasonableness of the difference in treatment which the challenged requirement imposes upon those in need of public assistance. There is no escape from the proposition that, in carrying forward a comprehensive program of this character, restrictions having no reasonable relationship to the basic purposes of the program are not immune from attack because the Congress was not under legal obligation to inaugurate the program. The *Thompson*, *Green*, and *Smith* cases, to which we have referred in other respects, support this position.

Defendants also contend that the restriction is reasonable because it is designed to protect this jurisdiction from an influx of persons seeking more generous public assistance than might be available elsewhere. Congress made no finding to that effect. As we have seen,[10] the reason for the one-year residence requirement given in the Report of the Senate Committee was uniformity. Assuming, however, that Congress had in mind the protective purpose advanced by defendants, we are reminded that the historical origin of the localized character of public assistance was the Elizabethan Poor Laws.[11] These laws enshrined the notion of "settlement," from which the concept of residence descended. Only those who were settled there were entitled to receive relief from a community. No doubt due in large part to the influence of these English laws—perhaps a subconscious influence—a number of our state legislatures adopted the idea of a minimum period of residence as a prerequisite to eligibility. But the Supreme Court pointed out more than twenty-five years ago that

> the theory of the Elizabethan poor laws no longer fits the facts. Recent years, and particularly the past decade, have been marked by a growing recognition that in an industrial society the task of providing

---

[9] See also Note, 73 Harv.L.Rev. 1595, 1599-1602 (1960).

[10] *Supra*, p. 5.

[11] The Poor Relief Act, 1601, 43 Eliz. 1, c. 2; The Poor Relief Act, 1662, 13 & 14 Car. 2, c. 12.

assistance to the needy has ceased to be local in character.

Edwards v. *California*, 314 U.S. 160, 174-75.

Another difficulty in accepting the protective assumption as giving constitutional support to the challenged provision, is the speculative character of the assumption from a factual standpoint. In 1956, the Deputy Commissioner of Social Welfare of the State of New York, which has not had a minimum period of residence for nearly a century, stated that in the preceding year only two per cent of all public assistance recipients had lived in New York for less than one year.[12] In 1963, the Moreland Commission on Public Welfare in New York, after a lengthy study of the entire fabric of public assistance, stated that it was opposed to residence requirements on the ground that "the present laws [designed to prevent abuse] are sufficient to protect the taxpayer without penalizing the unfortunate."[13] "To assume that people are influenced to move or not to move according to the availability of help on a relief basis is to misunderstand the dynamics of human behavior."[14] This is especially true in the United States. A committee of Congress has stated that "[g]eographical mobility has always been a habit of the American people."[15]

Even if some citizens do enter a state in order to obtain greater welfare aid, the possibility of this effect,

---

[12] Kasius, *What Happens in a State Without Residence Requirements*, in Residence Laws: Road Block to Human Welfare 19-20 (1956).

[13] *State of New York, Moreland Commission on Welfare, Public Welfare in the State of New York* 27-28 (1963). See also Hyde, *The Trouble with Residence Laws*, 16 *Public Welfare* 103, 105 (1958).

[14] Kasius, note 12 *supra*, at 20. See also Moreland Commission Report, *supra* note 13, at 28: ". . . welfare aid is not a lure for people on the move, and . . . migration to states where living is attractive is high *despite* strict residence requirements." (Emphasis in original.)

[15] *House Select Comm. Investigating National Defense Migration, Analysis of Material Bearing on the Economic Social Aspects of the Case of Edwards* v. *California*, 77th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1941).

alone, is not in the circumstances sufficient to require the court to sustain the residence condition. As against a similar contention in the *Green* case, the court interposed the decision of the Supreme Court in *Edwards* v. *California*, *supra*, saying that such a ground was "a constitutionally impermissible basis for separate state treatment." The court continued:

> The protection of the public purse, no matter how worthy in the abstract, is not a permissible basis for differentiating between persons who otherwise possess the same status in their relationship to the State of Delaware.

Assuming that a provision to prevent abuse of the public assistance program would be valid—a case of abuse is not before us—the challenged provision sweeps before it all who have less than the required residence, including bona fide residents who had come to this jurisdiction for reasons disassociated entirely from a desire to obtain relief. This is too broad to be sustained in light of the resulting inequality of treatment:

> [A]ssuming, for the purpose of argument only, that the basic prohibition is constitutional, it does not follow that there is no constitutional limit to the means which may be used to enforce it.

Oyama v. *California*, 332 U.S. 633, 646-47; and see concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan in *Trop* v. *Dulles*, 356 U.S. at 114, where he discussed the need of legislation to achieve desired ends by alternative methods open to less objection.

In *Thompson*, in language particularly applicable to our case, it is said:

> [I]f there were here a time limit applied equally to all, for the purpose of prevention of fraud, investigation of indigency or other reasonable administrative need, it would undoubtedly be valid. Connecticut's Commission of Welfare frankly testified that no residence requirement is needed for any of these purposes.

270 F. Supp. at 33.[16] And see *Green*, where the desire to avoid payments tainted with fraud or based on insufficient information, which the court said were of course legitimate ends, did not justify the one-year residence requirement, "particularly in view of the consequences to persons in need. . . ." 270 F. Supp. at 177. Whether or not a narrower provision designed to prevent abuse would be valid would of course depend upon its terms.[17]

The choice of twelve months denies plaintiffs the equal protection of the laws because, in a manner inconsistent with the basic purpose of the legislation, it bars them from assistance granted to others. That basic purpose, simply stated, is to aid members of the community who are in need. That the residence requirement serves other purposes—ease of administration, or discouragement of movement to the jurisdiction—does not help defendants when the consequence is to defeat the primary purpose of the legislation. Other means to accomplish secondary purposes must be sought. This is especially true when the discrimination perpetuates the conditions the legislation is designed to cure.[18]

It is also said by defendants that Congress in 42 U.S.C. § 602(b), where the basis for the federal contribution to state public assistance programs is set forth, has approved the one-year residence requirements of states. The fact is that Section 602(b) merely provides in this connection, that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall not approve any plan which denies aid on the basis of an eligibility requirement of more than a year.

---

[16] Clearly administrative convenience is not in and of itself adequate support for infringement of a constitutional right. *Harman* v. *Forssenius*, 380 U.S. 528, 542; *Schneider* v. *Rusk*, 377 U.S. 163, 167.

[17] The reliance of defendants in this connection upon *People* v. *Lyons*, 374 Ill. 557, 30 N.E.2d 46 (1940), does not take into account the necessity of avoiding constitutional infringement by channeling the legislation so as to meet more directly the abuse sought to be avoided. Moreover, with great respect for the Illinois court, the more recent decisions of the federal courts to which we have referred are more in harmony with our views in this matter.

[18] See Moreland Commission Report, *supra* note 13, at 28: "Administratively, . . . the cost of investigating cases and enforcing residence laws costs more money than is saved."

As to the possibility that the legislature intended to confine assistance to domiciliaries of the jurisdiction and that the one-year residence provides an objective legislative test of such status, the *Green* court held:

> the one year residency requirement prevents many applicants from obtaining assistance even though they are clearly living in Delaware with an intention to remain indefinitely. . . .

The court left open the question "whether a state could constitutionally confine the benefits of its public assistance programs to its own domiciliaries." We also are not called upon to decide this question, for it is not disputed that the plaintiffs are bona fide domiciliaries of the District who came for reasons disassociated from the desire to obtain relief not elsewhere available.[19]

Finally, it is suggested that if the one-year residence provision is invalidated the whole program falls with it. We hold otherwise. No such result was held to follow in the *Thompson*, *Green* and *Smith* cases. It would not be reasonable to impute such an intention to Congress. Moreover, Section 203 is part of Chapter 2 of Title 3 of the Code, and Section 223 of the chapter conclusively demonstrates Congress entertained no such intention. Section 223 is explicit:

> If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the chapter and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Views which support the validity of the one-year condition are well advanced by our dissenting brother, and by Judge Clarie, dissenting in *Thompson*. We readily acknowledge there is no absolute certainty about the reach of the Equal Protection Clause in this area of the law. "But the ordeal of judgment cannot be shirked." *Trop*

---

[19] The regulation under which plaintiff Vera M. Barley was denied assistance, based on her residing in a public institution, falls with the reasoning of our decision applicable to the other plaintiffs, especially in light of the factual situation of plaintiff Barley as outlined in footnote 3, *supra*.

v. *Dulles*, *supra* at 104. We are encouraged to make the judgment we do not only by the decisions in *Thompson*, *Green* and *Smith*, but by the over-all salutary action of Congress in entering into the welfare programs of which Section 3-203 is a part. This national movement toward assistance where assistance is needed, and the human terms of the problem, permit the court somewhat greater latitude in deciding that this difference in the treatment of those in our midst who are in need amounts to unequal protection of the laws than if the treatment were with respect to some matter less critical to their living conditions.

An appropriate judgment will be entered based on our ruling that the one-year residence requirements of Section 3-203(a)(b) of our Code are invalid in application to plaintiffs and those in like circumstances. Counsel for the parties are requested to seek agreement on the form of judgment, taking into consideration any changes in the parties who are defendants due to reorganization of the Government of the District of Columbia.

/s/ DAVID L. BAZELON
Chief Circuit Judge

/s/ CHARLES FAHY
Senior Circuit Judge

Dated: November 2, 1967.

BAZELON, *Chief Judge*, concurring: I concur in Judge Fahy's opinion and would only emphasize that equal protection requires a statutory classification to be reasonably related to a "proper governmental objective," *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954), and that to deter indigents from settling in the District of Columbia is not such an objective, *Edwards* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 160 (1941).

* * * *

HOLTZOFF, District Judge, dissenting. I respectfully dissent from the conclusion of the majority that the Dis-

trict of Columbia statute prescribing a residence requirement of one year for eligibility for receiving public assistance is unconstitutional, as transgressing the Equal Protection of the Laws Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and as interfering with freedom of travel. In my opinion the enactment is a valid exercise of legislative power.

Each of the three consolidated actions now before the Court was instituted by an applicant for public assistance from the District of Columbia, whose request was denied by the local Welfare authorities, on the ground that she was ineligible because she had not been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least one year. In each instance, the plaintiff seeks a judgment setting aside the adverse action of the local Public Welfare authorities; requiring them to pass on the application for relief without regard to the residence requirement; and declaring the statutory provision imposing the residence requirement to be unconstitutional.

The District of Columbia statute involved in these cases is D.C. Code § 3-203, the pertinent provisions of which read as follows:

> § 3-203. *Eligibility for public assistance.*
>
> "Public assistance shall be awarded to or on behalf of any needy individual who either (a) has *resided in the District for one year immediately preceding the date of filing his application for such assistance;* or (b) who was born within one year immediately preceding the application for such aid, if the parent or other relative with whom the child is living has resided in the District for one year immediately preceding the birth; or (c) is otherwise within one of the categories of public assistance established by this chapter: . . ." [Emphasis supplied.]

The constitutionality of clauses (a) and (b) of the above statute is attacked in these actions.

In two of these cases the plaintiff is a mother with dependent children. The funds out of which public assistance for dependent children is disbursed by the States

(including the District of Columbia) are in part provided by the individual States and in part by a grant from the Federal Government, authorized by the Social Security Act, Subchapter IV, entitled, "Grants to States for Aid and Services to Needy Families with Children", 42 U.S.C. § 601 *et seq.* In order to be eligible for a Federal grant for this purpose, a State is required to submit a plan to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, containing certain specified provisions, 42 U.S.C. § 602(a). Subsection (b) of that section contains the following requirement:

> "(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section, except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes as a condition of eligibility for aid to families with dependent children, a residence requirement which denied aid with respect to any child residing in the State (1) who has resided in the State for one year immediately preceding the application for such aid, or (2) who was born within one year immediately preceding the application, if the parent or other relative with whom the child is living has resided in the State for one year immediately preceding the birth."

In other words, the Social Security Act expressly authorizes States receiving Federal grants for aid to dependent children, to impose residence requirements for eligibility for relief, with the limitation that such residence requirements shall not exceed one year. Consequently, insofar as aid to dependent children is concerned, the residence requirement enacted by the District of Columbia was expressly authorized by the Social Security Act, under which Federal grants are made to the States for that purpose. While the complaints in these actions do not expressly attack the validity of this provision of the Social Security Act, nevertheless, by necessary implication, a ruling that the District of Columbia statute is unconstitutional must also strike down in its wake the provision of the Social Security Act authorizing the enactment of such local requirements.

Statutes imposing specific residence prerequisites for receiving relief have been in existence in many States for a long time. They are not restricted to aid to dependent children, but in a broad scope are generally applicable to relief payments of all kinds. The usual residence requirement is one year. Without any attempt at making an exhaustive enumeration, a partial survey shows that the following States, among others, impose a residence requirement of at least one year as a qualification for receiving relief of any type: Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Colorado, Utah and Oregon. Virginia imposes such a condition for several types of relief. Such provisions are accepted as appropriate and prudent, if not indispensable, features of any system of administering relief to needy persons. The obvious purpose of such restrictions is to minimize the likelihood of imposition and abuses, even though at times they result in hardship to some individuals. The wisdom, policy, desirability, and expediency of such conditions are not within the purview of the judiciary, but must be determined by the legislature. The powers of Government are vested primarily in an elective Legislative body and an elective Executive. Were they to be shifted in whole or in part to the courts, composed of members holding office by permanent tenure, we would cease to have a popular form of government. An oligarchy would supplant it, no matter how benevolent.

If the conclusion of the majority is sound, the necessary consequence would be that all such local statutes must be deemed invalid and that no specific residence requirement may be constitutionally imposed by the States as eligibility for welfare payments. The relief systems of most of the States would have to be revamped, transformed, and reorganized.

While the number and nature of statutes relating to welfare legislation that would be rendered invalid under the ruling of the majority need not deter the courts from declaring all of them unconstitutional, if in fact they clearly transgress some constitutional limitation, nevertheless, the number and extent of such statutes and the

fact that they are an accepted feature of welfare legislation generally, should lead the court to pause. Doubts should be resolved in favor of validity, instead of upsetting all over the country well-established local plans for administering relief funds.

Members of the judiciary must not be influenced by their own views of the wisdom, expediency, or desirability of legislation, or by their own attitude toward charity. They must limit themselves to considering objectively and solely the constitutional power to enact the statute that is being challenged. As was said by Cardozo in *The Paradoxes of Legal Science*, "Legislature as well as court is an interpreter and a guardian of constitutional immunities." (p. 121).

While in determining justiciable cases and controversies brought before the Courts by persons having standing to sue, the courts in case of a conflict between an applicable statute and a pertinent constitutional provision, must have recourse to the Constitution as the supreme law of the land and ignore the statute, thereby adjudging the statute to be unconstitutional, the power to render such a decision must be exercised with caution, circumspection and deliberation. Statutes may not be lightly set aside by the judiciary on the theory that they contravene some constitutional limitation. It is a basic principle that there is a strong presumption of constitutionality as to every legislative enactment. This presumption must be clearly overcome before a statute may be declared invalid. The presumption of validity is not a mere form, but a potent rule that must be actively applied by the courts. Again, as was said by Cardozo,[1] "The presumption of validity should be more than a pious formula, to be sanctimoniously repeated at the opening of an opinion and forgotten at the end."

Chief Justice Marshall developed and expounded the doctrine that if in a justiciable controversy instituted by a party having standing to sue, it is determined that an applicable statute is in conflict with the Constitution the issues should be determined in accordance with the Con-

[1] The Paradoxes of Legal Science, p. 125.

stitution and the statute declared invalid, *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch. 137. He, nevertheless, called for caution in the exercise of this prerogative and announced that it should be exerted only if the conviction of incompatibility was clear and strong. He said in *Fletcher* v. *Peck*, 6 Cranch. 87, 128:

> "The question, whether a law be void for its repugnancy to the constitution, is, at all times, a question of much delicacy, which ought seldom, if ever, to be decided in the affirmative, in a doubtful case. The court, when impelled by duty to render such a judgment, would be unworthy of its station, could it be unmindful of the solemn obligations which that station imposes. But it is not on slight implication and vague conjecture, that the legislature is to be pronounced to have transcended its powers, and its acts to be considered as void. The opposition between the constitution and the law should be such that the judge feels a clear and strong conviction of their incompatibility with each other."

He reiterated this doctrine in *Brown* v. *Maryland*, 12 Wheat. 419, 436:

> "It has been truly said, that the presumption is in favor of every legislative act, and that the whole burden of proof lies on him who denies it constitutionality."

Chief Justice Waite summarized the same principle in the following manner, *Sinking-Fund Cases*, 99 U.S. 700, 718:

> "It is our duty, when required in the regular course of judicial proceedings, to declare an act of Congress void if not within the legislative power of the United States; but this declaration should never be made except in a clear case. Every possible presumption is in favor of the validity of a statute, and this continues until the contrary is shown beyond a rational doubt. One branch of the government cannot encroach on the domain of another without dan-

ger. The safety of our institutions depends in no small degree on a strict observance of this salutary rule."

Coming down to our own times, Mr. Justice Stone in *Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.* v. *Glidden Co. et al.*, 284 U.S. 151, 158, emphasized that when legislation deals with a subject that is within the scope of legislative power, "the presumption of constitutionality is to be indulged."

In *United States* v. *National Dairy Corp.*, 372 U.S. 32, Mr. Justice Clark referred to the principle that a strong presumptive validity attaches to an Act of Congress.

Cases enunciating and applying this doctrine are legion. The following are a few of them: *Dartmouth College* v. *Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518, 625; *Legal Tender Cases*, 12 Wall. 457, 531; *Munn* v. *Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113, 123; *United States* v. *Harris*, 106 U.S. 629, 635; *Close* v. *Glenwood Cemetery*, 107 U.S. 466, 475; *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R.R.* v. *Matthews*, 174 U.S. 96, 104; *Middleton* v. *Texas Power & Light Co.*, 249 U.S. 152, 157; *O'Gorman & Young, Inc.* v. *Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, 282 U.S. 251, 257-258.

The principles that the Supreme Court formulated as a guide primarily for itself in deciding constitutional questions are *a fortiori* binding and controlling on District Courts and Courts of Appeals. From the early years of the Republic and through the first half of the Nineteenth Century, the Supreme Court consistently and rigidly adhered to these doctrines in passing upon the validity of legislative enactments. Thus, between 1790 and 1860 only two Acts of Congress were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.[2] One of them, which was stricken down in *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch. 137, was a provision of the Judicial Code of minor importance relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

A shift in the attitude toward the validity of legislative measures began after the Civil War and the subsequent enactment of the Fourteenth Amendment. From time to

---

[2] Robert H. Jackson, *The Struggle for Judicial Supremacy*, p. 40.

time legislation in the social and economic field was held invalid as repugnant to the Due Process Clause or the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. These provisions were deemed to enact into the Constitution the right of freedom of contract and the privilege of using one's property without governmental interference. During the decade beginning in 1920, the number of Acts of Congress declared invalid rose to a high point.[3] Almost invariably these decisions were reached against emphatic protests contained in dissenting opinions of members of the Court who were in the minority, but who have been regarded as enlightened, progressive and far-sighted. Their dissenting opinions form part of the classics of our constitutional history and constitutional law.

In *Lochner* v. *New York*, 198 U.S. 45, in which a statute regulating the hours of labor in a bakery was held invalid as interfering with the freedom of contract, Mr. Justice Holmes wrote a forceful dissenting opinion, which has been often quoted and which is worthy of repetition. He said (p. 75):

> "This case is decided upon an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain. If it were a question whether I agreed with that theory, I should desire to study it further and long before making up my mind. But I do not conceive that to be my duty, because I strongly believe that my agreement or disagreement has nothing to do with the right of the majority to embody their opinions in law. It is settled by various decisions of this court that state constitutions and state laws may regulate life in many ways which we as legislators might think as injudicious or if you like as tyrannical as this, and which equally with this interfere with the liberty to contract. . . . *The Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

Mr. Justice Holmes again spoke out emphatically in protest against the decision of the majority in *Hammer*

---

[3] Robert H. Jackson, *Id.* p. 40.

v. *Dagenhart*, 247 U.S. 251, in which the Supreme Court invalidated an Act of Congress prohibiting transportation in interstate commerce of goods manufactured in a factory employing child labor. In his dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Holmes said, in part (p. 280):

> "I had thought that the propriety of the exercise of a power admitted to exist in some cases was for the consideration of Congress alone and that this Court always had disavowed the right to intrude its judgment upon questions of policy or morals. It is not for this Court to pronounce when prohibition is necessary to regulation if it ever may be necessary. . . ."

During that era there were numerous expressions in dissenting opinions of a similar tenor culminating in the celebrated dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stone in *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1, in which the Court held the Agricultural Adjustment Act to be unconstitutional. His ringing words deserve frequent reiteration. He said, in part (pp. 78-79, 87):

> "The power of courts to declare a statute unconstitutional is subject to two guiding principles of decision which ought never to be absent from judicial consciousness. One is that *courts are concerned only with the power to enact statutes, not with their wisdom.* The other is that while unconstitutional exercise of power by the executive and legislative branches of the government is subject to judicial restraint, the only check upon our own exercise of power is *our own sense of self-restraint.*"
>
> * * * *
>
> "*Courts are not the only agency of government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

The minority in many of these cases intimated from time to time that the majority were unconsciously influenced by their own personal predilections in social and economic matters. The situation became of sufficient moment for two Presidents of the United States to register protests in different ways. President Theodore Roosevelt sug-

gested one remedy, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt recommended another.[4] As a matter of coincidence at about the time when the proposal of President Franklin Roosevelt was defeated in Congress, the Supreme Court seemed to reverse its attitude, going as far as overruling some of the prior decisions to which reference has been made, *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish*, 300 U.S. 379, in which Mr. Chief Justice Hughes wrote the prevailing opinion. A new era in American constitutional history arrived. The tendency of the Supreme Court to annul social welfare legislation, which had prevailed for several decades was drastically ended, and was supplanted by a more progressive trend. It is to be hoped that the pendulum will not swing back and inaugurate another cycle when it may be said that personal social and economic predilections of judges unconsciously influence decisions on constitutionality of legislation,—even though the predictions may be dicerent.

In my opinion the statutory provision challenged in these cases is clearly a valid exercise of legislative power. Relief and welfare payments by the Government are grants. They are not the payment of legal obligations. The legislative branch of the Government in providing grants has a right to select objects for which and the persons to whom they shall be made. That it chooses to make grants to members of one group does not mean that it is under an obligation to make similar grants to members of another group, even though the second group may be similar to the first and equally worthy. *A fortiori* the fact that Congress has authorized grants to be made to members of one group, does not empower the courts to extend them to members of the second group.

Even in connection with meeting legal and moral obligations, the Congress may make distinctions between objects and persons. For example, by the Federal Tort Claims Act the Congress waived the soverign immunity of the

[4] For interesting accounts by two active participants in the controversy involved in the proposals of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, see Robert H. Jackson, *The Struggle for Judicial Supremacy*, pp. 177 et seq.; and Burton K. Wheeler, *Yankee from the West*, pp. 319 *et seq.*

United States to suit in tort. It excepted, however, certain specified torts. Surely, it would not be contended that the exceptions are invalid and that, therefore, the immunity should extend to torts in the excepted list. So, too, certain groups of persons, such as Government employees, have been held to be outside of the scope of the Federal Tort Claims Act. Surely, it cannot be contended that these exceptions are likewise invalid and that, therefore, by judicial construction Government employees are entitled to the benefits of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

No basis for invalidity is discernible in a limitation of grants or welfare and relief funds to residents of the State. In fact, the majority opinion so concedes. The legislature, however, is not compelled to leave the matter of determining whether a particular person is or is not a resident to administrative officials. Such a course would be administratively inefficient, ponderous and slow, as well as expensive. No reason is perceived why Congress may not provide a simple formula for distinguishing permanent residents of the State from other persons who happen to be sojourning in it at any one time. Residence for one year is such a test. There are numerous rights and privileges that are conferred on residents of a State but which are denied to other persons within its boundaries. An outstanding example is the residence requirement for voters, imposing a specified length of residence within the State. Certain occupations are at times limited to residents. Numerous examples may be cited.

A somewhat similar question arose in *Flemming* v. *Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603. The Social Security Act contains a provision cutting off old age insurance benefits and disability insurance benefits from any person who has been deported from the United States on any one of specified grounds, 42 U.S.C. § 402(n)(1). The validity of this provision was challenged in that case. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of this Section, even though it related to benefits of a contributory insurance scheme to which the insured had made periodic payment, instead of consisting of mere grants, as is the case here. In discussing this question the Supreme Court wrote as follows (p. 611):

> "In judging the permissibility of the cut-off provision of [§ 402(n)] . . . from this standpoint, it is not within our authority to determine whether the Congressional judgment expressed in that section is sound or equitable, or whether it comports well or ill with the purposes of the Act. 'Whether wisdom or unwisdom resides in the scheme of benefits set forth in Title II, it is not for us to say. The answer to such inquiries must come from Congress, not the courts. Our concern here, as often, is with power not with wisdom.' . . . Particularly when we deal with a withholding of a noncontractual benefit under a social welfare program such as this, we must recognize that the Due Process Clause can be thought to interpose a bar only if the statute manifests a patently arbitrary classification, utterly lacking in rational justification."

As concerns the Equal Protection of the Laws Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, it needs no citation of authorities to establish that reasonable classifications are not a violation of that constitutional provision. Admittedly, it is reasonable to differentiate between residents and non-residents for the purpose of making relief payments. The one-year requirement is a simple method of distinguishing between the two groups. The Legislature does not have to adopt a ponderous system of taking evidence as to each applicant to determine whether the applicant is a *bona fide* resident of the State. As heretofore stated, such a method of administration might well bog down the whole relief system in delays, expenses and frustration. Legislatures may have valid reasons for limiting relief payments to residents of the State for a specific minimum period. Whether we would approve the same course as a matter of policy and expediency is immaterial. The manifest purpose of the legislation is to prevent a particular State or District from becoming a Mecca for migrants from other States where relief payments are smaller. This is a reasonable and legitimate purpose.

A survey of relief payments in some of the neighboring States, as compared with those made in the District of Columbia, clearly demonstrates the reason for the possible

fear of the District of Columbia that it might be confronted with an invasion of prospective applicants for relief from other States, if it were not for the residence qualification. For example, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the average monthly grant of aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia for a family was $168.08; in Virginia, it was $123.59; in Maryland, it was $163.22; in West Virginia, only $98.14; in North Carolina, it was $24.24 per person. The average grant of old age assistance in the District of Columbia was $67.20, as compared with $60.29 in Maryland; $48.16 in West Virginia; and $58.06 in North Carolina. The average monthly grant of aid to disabled was $81.72 in the District of Columbia, as compared with $75.57 in Maryland; $77.82 in Virginia; $45.77 in West Virginia; and $64.36 in North Carolina.

The second infirmity found in the statute by the majority opinion is that the limitation interferes with freedom of travel. The right to travel throughout the realm is concededly one of the privileges and immunities of a citizen of the United States. Clearly the District of Columbia or any one of the States, would be without power to block the entrance of any person residing within the United States, or in any way directly to interfere with travel between the States. The existence of this right does not bar the Congress, however, from imposing a tax on railroad, airline or bus tickets and thereby making travel more costly. It does not constitute an invalid interference with the right of travel from State to State, or from any State to the District of Columbia, to impose residence requirements for voters, or for the pursuit of specified occupations. The same reasoning applies to residence requirements for eligibility to relief payments.

The decision in *Edwards* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 160, 174 is clearly distinguishable. The statute held invalid in that case made it a criminal offense to bring in or assist in bringing in to the State any indigent person who was not a resident of the State. This enactment created a direct interference with the right of travel. The opinion of the Supreme Court pointed out clearly that all that was being determined was the propriety of an attempt

by a State to prohibit transportation of indigent nonresidents and the question of relief to newcomers was not involved. At page 174, the Court stated:

> ". . . we are not now called upon to determine anything other than the propriety of an attempt by a State to prohibit the transportation of indigent nonresidents into its territory. The nature and extent of its obligation to afford relief to newcomers is not here involved."

There is another and very important aspect to the subject under discussion. If the exclusion of persons who have not resided in the jurisdiction for at least one year is stricken down, the entire relief plan falls. This is not a case where one provision of the statute is so disconnected from the balance that the rest can stand even if the one provision be held invalid. Here the residence requirement is part of the scheme enacted by the Congress. If it is held that the Congress may not provide for welfare payments of one kind or another without including persons who have sojourned in the jurisdiction for less than one year, it does not follow that if the exclusion is annulled payment may be made to those persons whom Congress has expressly excluded. If the Congress passes an Act making grants to members of Group A and the Court holds that Congress may not constitutionally do so without extending the benefits to members of Group B, the result is that the entire scheme becomes invalid. The Courts may not accord the benefits of the Act to members of Group B by practically amending the statute. Congress may well say that if we cannot limit our grants to members of Group A, no grants shall be made at all if we must include members of Group B. In other words, the subject must go back to Congress, and the entire statute dealing with public assistance, D.C. Code § 3:201-223 must be deemed invalid.

Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Dorchy* v. *Kansas*, 264 U.S. 286, 290, a case that has often been cited as authoritative, summarized the governing principle as follows:

> "But a provision, inherently unobjectionable, cannot be deemed separable unless it appears both that,

> standing alone, legal effect can be given to it and that the legislature intended the provision to stand, in case others included in the act and held bad should fall."

The fact that the statute contains a severability clause is not decisive. It merely shifts the burden of proof from the plaintiff to the defendant on the question whether the balance of the statute can remain operative if one part is excised as invalid.

In *Hill* v. *Walace*, 259 U.S. 44, 71, the Court stated:

> ". . . undoubtedly such a provision furnishes assurance to courts that they may properly sustain separate sections or provisions of a partly invalid act without hesitation or doubt as to whether they would have been adopted, even if the legislature had been advised of the invalidity of part. *But it does not give the court power to amend the act.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

In this instance if the exclusion of persons who have not resided in the jurisdiction for at least one year, is stricken down with the intention that this group should receive the benefit of the Act, the majority of the Court would be amending the Act and expanding its scope. The exclusion is part of the warp and woof of the statute and not a separable clause.

In *Railroad Retirement Board* v. *Alton Railroad Co.*, 295 U.S. 330, 362, the Court discussed the effect of a severability clause as follows:

> "Such a declaration provides a rule which may aid in determining the legislative intent, but is not an inexorable command. *Dorchy* v. *Kansas*, 264 U.S. 286. It has the effect of reversing the presumption which would otherwise be indulged, of an intent that unless the act operates as an entirety it shall be wholly ineffective. . . . But notwithstanding the presumption in favor of divisibility which arises from the legislative declaration, we cannot rewrite a statute and give it an effect altogether different from that sought by the measure viewed as a whole."

In *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 313, the Court succinctly summarized this doctrine and the effect of the severability clause as follows:

> "The statutory aid to construction in no way alters the rule that in order to hold one part of a statute unconstitutional and uphold another part as separable, they must not be mutually dependent upon one another."

The conclusion is inescapable that if the Court strikes down the provision of the public assistance statute of the District of Columbia limiting the benefits of the Act to needy individuals who have resided in the District of Columbia for at least one year, the entire statute is nullified, because Congress did not legislate to make grants to any one who does not meet the eligibility requirement; and if this qualification is annulled, the entire Act falls. The Court may not by construction extend the provisions of the Act to persons not included in it. The only remedy would be new legislation.

I am not unmindful of the fact that a similar residence requirement in Delaware has been recently held unconstitutional by a three-judge District Court, *Green* v. *Department of Public Welfare*, 270 F. Supp. 173; and likewise that a Connecticut statute that is somewhat akin to that involved here was held unconstitutional in *Thompson* v. *Shapiro*, 270 F. Supp. 331, by a vote of two to one. With due deference and respect for these two courts, the decisions do not seem persuasive. In the Connecticut case Judge Clarie's dissenting opinion is more convincing than the majority view. Moreover, the Connecticut statute is quite different from the customary residence requirement. It excludes from the benefits of the welfare statute any person who comes into the State without visible means for support and applies for aid within one year after arrival. It is not a provision basing eligibility on residence alone. Neither the Delaware case, nor the Connecticut decision, consider the question of severability and whether striking down the residence requirement would invalidate the entire statutory scheme. Apparently that point did not come to the attention of either Court.

The Social Security Act is a comprehensive, far-reaching, progressive statute of epochal social and economic significance. It was framed on the basis of detailed studies by Committees created by the President. It was thoroughly and carefully considered by the Congress and its Committees. The legislation was the fruit of long and thorough studies and scrutiny on the part of numerous persons. The statute introduced social insurance into the United States on a large scale. Its beneficent contributory plans for compulsory old age insurance and for unemployment insurance accorded permanent economic security and independence to millions of persons who had lived in dread as to what was to become of them in old age or in case of loss of employment for a lengthy period. The public assistance features of the legislation, such as aid to dependent children, which is involved in this legislation, were created as auxiliaries to the insurance schemes. The basic constitutionality of the Act was sustained by the Supreme Court in the leading case of *Helvering* v. *Davis*, 301 U.S. 619. No feature of the statute has been invalidated until the present time.

If the decision of the majority stands, the provisions for aid to dependent children will be thrown into confusion and possibly destroyed. The entire District of Columbia legislation for public assistance likewise becomes a nullity. Such an outcome must be regretted.

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF
United States District Judge.

October 17, 1967.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action No. 1497-67

MINNIE HARRELL, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS
CLAY MAE LEGRANT, PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR

v.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Civil Action No. 1579-67

VERA M. BARLEY, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Civil Action No. 1749-67

GLORIA JEAN BROWN, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS
CLAY MAE LEGRANT, PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR

v.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

DECREE

This Court having declared that Sections 3-203 (a) and (b), District of Columbia Code, (1967 ed.) are unconstitutional and having further declared that District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance, EL 9.I, III, B, 3, is unconstitutional, it is

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, that the defendants Walter E. Washington, as Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Winifred G. Thompson, as Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, Donald G. Gray, as Chief of the Public

Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, Undine Wilson, as Chief, Intake Service Unit, Public Assistance Division, Department of Public Welfare for the District of Columbia, their agents, officers, employees and successors in office, be and each is hereby permanently enjoined:

1. From enforcing or giving any legal effect to the provisions of Sections 3-203(a) and (b), District of Columbia Code, (1967 ed.);

2. From enforcing or giving any legal effect to such provisions of EL 9.I of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare Handbook of Public Assistance which implement Sections 3-203(a) and (b), District of Columbia Code (1967 ed.) by requiring as a condition for applying for or obtaining Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, or General Public Assistance, that a resident of the District of Columbia reside in the District of Columbia for a period of one year;

3. From refusing to process any application for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, or General Public Assistance made to the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare or in any way denying public assistance in any of the forementioned categories of aid to any resident of the District of Columbia solely for the reason that such person has not resided in the District of Columbia for a period of one year.

The requests of plaintiffs for further relief are denied, as unnecessary, since it is assumed that the defendants will fully and in good faith comply with this decree.

November 28, 1967

/s/ David L. Bazelon
Chief Circuit Judge

/s/ Charles Fahy
Senior Circuit Judge

I dissent.

/s/ Alexander Holtzoff
United States District Judge